













# Fyzabad Settlement Report

  
Librarian  
Krishna Public Library



1383. The above remarks may seem to refer more to rent than revenue, and to the internal management of the estate than the assessment of the Government demand upon it; but the estate, though under Government management, is very heavily in arrears with its revenue, and the latter fact is considered to be in no small degree attributable to the former. Nor does this seem, to say the least, improbable, even if the relation of cause and effect between them be not distinctly traceable, and it receives some corroboration from the contrast between the present and former condition of the estate. Under native rule it has been seen that both rent and revenue were punctually paid; the double converse now holds good. The revenue demand was probably lower then than it is now; but if so, it follows necessarily that it has now been enhanced. With regard to the rent-roll, on the other hand, it is clear that annexation has disturbed the relations previously existing between the talukdar and the principal, if not the largest, section of his tenantry, and the attempt to raise the rents of the latter has often resulted only in the diminution of actual receipts.

1384. The account that has now been given will sufficiently explain the bearing of sub-tenures upon the assessment, at all events, of this particular estate.

1385. In this tahsil, "the rise in the Government demand was nothing like so high...as elsewhere". In two of the four parganas, however, revision led to considerable reductions.

### PARGANA HAVELI OUDH.

1386. A small compact pargana between the Gogra and the Madha, containing 127 square miles divided into 184 villages, among which are included Fyzabad, the Military Cantonments (Chhaoni Sarkar), and Ajudhya. A few miles from these is the large bazaar of Darshannagar, while there are others of less importance in different parts of the pargana.

The means of communication are abundant. The Gogra runs all along the north of the pargana, which is also traversed from side to side by the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway (with stations at Fyzabad, Ajudhya, Darshannagar, and Nara) and further possesses several good roads.

1387. Of the 184 villages in the pargana, 117 are held by talukdars, but 103 of them are sub-settled. Of the remaining 67 villages, five and a fraction are nazúl.

1388. Of the nazúl villages, the two most important, Fyzabad and Ajudhya, have been exempted from assessment. Up to the regular settlement they had never been treated as revenue-paying villages, either during native rule (when they were under the separate management of the sayer department), or during the summary settlement; and on special reference it was decided that they should not now be assessed to the imperial revenue, but be left as before in the hands of the nazúl department.

1389. The population statistics are of course exceptional. The rate per square mile is 1044, partly of course owing to the cities of Ajudhya and Fyzabad, and for the same reason the proportion of agriculturists is comparatively small, being only 43 per cent. Musalmáns form 16 per cent. of the total population, and high-caste Hindús 20. The proportion of Kurnís among the agriculturists is somewhat in excess of the district average, and with respect to Muraos that average is more than doubled.

1390. Of the total area of the pargana, 25 per cent. is unproductive, 19 per cent. being actually barren; groves cover 6 per cent., 14 per cent. is culturable waste, and 55 per cent., is cultivated. Of the last 67 per cent. is doras, 22 matyár, and 11 bhúr; 63 per cent. of it is irrigated (rather more than a third from wells) and 28 per cent. manured. "The natural soils are of average quality, but the cultivation is high." Nine villages contain manjhas.

1391. For assessment purposes the pargana was divided into four circles, and the rates used were as follows:—

			Average rent-rates.			Class rates.		
			Goind.	Majhar.	Pálo.	First.	Second.	Third.
			Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
Circle	I	...	14 4 6	8 6 7	4 3 6	14 4 5	8 6 5	4 3 6
"	II	...	7 9 10	4 11 2	2 0 11	5 5 0	4 6 9	3 15 0
"	III	...	6 13 7	4 3 7	1 13 7	4 14 0	3 15 6	3 8 9
"	IV	...	6 9 7	4 1 0	1 12 6	4 9 3	3 12 0	3 5 3

1392. The exceptional rates, however, were confined to a circle comprising only Fyzabad and Ajudhia and the villages in their immediate vicinity (in which high rents, sometimes exceeding Rs. 20 per bigah, prevailed), and the area to which they were applied, originally very small, was rendered much smaller still by the non-assessment of Ajudhya and Fyzabad.

1393. For the assessment of groves and garden lands in and near Ajudhya and Fyzabad special rules were framed by Mr. Carnegy, but these need not be described, as, owing to the non-assessment of the two cities, they took effect on a very limited scale only in the first instance, and in the recent revision they were very much modified. In the neighbourhood of Lucknow and Sitapur, as of other large towns also, groves have been with the approval of Government left unassessed, and in the result of the recent revision groves in and near Fyzabad and Ajudhya, which mostly belong to poor Mahomedans or persons of religious orders, have been treated in the same manner.

1394. The test jamas for the old pargana were, inclusive of cesses :—

				Rs.
Soil	...	...	...	99,932
Deduced	...	...	...	95,574
Rent-roll	...	...	...	...
Class	...	...	...	97,073

1395. The result of the assessment was to fix the Government demand on the pargana at Rs. 97,504-11-9 land revenue, and, including cesses, Rs. 99,940. Its incidence was Rs. 2-2-8 per acre of cultivation, and it was a rise upon the summary jama, Rs. 74,673-3-0 (exclusive of cesses), of 31 per cent. It was declared on the 29th February, 1868, and introduced in 1277 fasli. Whether any objections were filed at the time of its declaration is not clear from the tahsil report, from which, however, it is to be gathered that in the whole tahsil there were only eight objections by independent proprietors, and four by Mahārāja Mán Singh (para. 1370) regarding villages in his estate.

1396. In the recent revision the original assessment was not much lowered. While the *The revision.* pargana has special advantages in respect of position, population, communications, and bazaars, the assessment rates were not unusually high, except in the small circle in which there were special reasons for their being so. In all 182 petitions were filed, affecting 123 villages in 38 maháls; and on 105 of these the assessment was modified in 64 villages in 24 maháls. The reductions amounted to 5·6 per cent. of the original demand on the pargana. The revisions were introduced in 1283 fasli (July, 1875).

1397. The Government demand as it now stands, irrespective of the progressive jamas *Jama ultimately fixed.* detailed in statement Va., is Rs. 92,571 land revenue, or, cesses included, Rs. 94,883. This is about 24 per cent. more than the summary jama; its incidence is Rs. 2-0-11 per acre of cultivation.

### PARGANA MANGALSI

1398. A long narrow pargana between the Gogra and the Madha, in the north-west corner of the district. It contains 116 square miles, divided into 114 villages, of which those on the north-east adjoin the Civil Station and Cantonments. Seven villages have bazaars. The railway (which has stations at Sohwal, near Raunahi, and Barágaon) runs right through the pargana, and the Gogra flows all along its northern side, but it is badly provided with roads. *Description of pargana.*

1399. Though there is but one taluka in the parganah, it contains 71 villages. Of these, however, 27 are sub-settled, so that about three-fifths of the pargana is held by petty proprietors or coparcenary communities.

1400. The population is very dense, the rate per square mile being no less than 800, and 65 per cent. of it is agricultural. There is nothing exceptional in the proportion of the principal agricultural castes.

1401. Of the total area of the pargana, 62 per cent. is under cultivation, 7 per cent. is under groves, 11 per cent. is

culurable waste, and 20 per cent. is unproductive, though no more than 3 per cent. is actually barren. The cultivation contains 66, 22, and 12 per cent. respectively of doras, matyár, and bhúr ; 63 per cent. of it is irrigated (rather more than a third from wells) and 28 per cent. manured. Along the Gogra lie several large manjhas. With the exception of these and two sandy belts towards east and west, "the soil of the pargana is generally admirable."

Rates employed.

1402. The assessment rates were :—

Average rent-rates.			Class rates.		
Goind.	Majhar.	Pálo.	First.	Second.	Third.
Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
6 11 7	4 0 5	1 12 6	6 6 0	4 6 3	3 6 8

1403. The method of assessment adopted in this pargana was to some extent distinctive ; Method of assessment. jamabandis were much more utilized than elsewhere ; and, indeed, the amended jamabandi was made the basis of the assessment.

1404. That amendment of the jamabandis was made with extreme care, the relative quality of the khalisa and other descriptions of land being attentively observed during the local inspections, and the rates given by the former being subjected to the necessary modification in their application to the latter. Unfortunately, however, the jamabandis that had to be used were in great measure those of the Mahdona estate, and as the principal revisions in this pargana were made by Mr. Ferrar, I quote the following remarks of his on the original assessment. This, he says, "had been made by Mr. Carnegie on Mr. Woodburn's notes. Mr. Carnegie did not inspect the pargana himself, and he thus in several instances (*e.g.* Mauza Sháhpur) allowed himself to be wrongly guided rather by the figured statements than by Mr. Woodburn's careful description of the village. On the other hand he lowered more than one of his Assistant's jamas. But both officers in this pargana laid too much stress on the jamabandis. Two-thirds



of the pargana is in the Madhona taluka, and previous to and at the time of assessment was with under-proprietors. In relying so much as he did on the jamabandis given in for these villages, Mr. Carnegie would appear to have forgotten both what is in his printed report on tahsil Fyzabad, para. 29, and what he wrote in the No. II. statement of Mauza Ghoripur (Ghiyaspur), pargana Pachhimráth, to the effect that the jamabandis in taluka Mahdona were extortionate and could not be relied upon as a basis for the assessment."

1405. It follows also as a necessary consequence of the rules in force at the time of the assessment that, notwithstanding the existence of some troublesome sub-settlements (para. 1404), no allowance was made on that account.

1406. The test jamas for the old parganas were :—

				Rs.
Soil	...	...	...	1,11,874
Deducted	...	...	...	1,11,356
Rent-roll	...	...	...	1,12,463
Class	...	...	...	1,12,316

1407. The result of the assessment was to fix the Government demand on the old pargana at Rs 1,16,735, inclusive of cesses. The corresponding demand on the present pargana was Rs. 1,05,692-2-0 land revenue, or, including cesses, Rs. 1,08,330. It was an increase of only 20 per cent. on the summary jama, but its incidence was Rs. 2-4-4 per acre of cultivation. It was declared on the 29th June, 1868, and introduced at the beginning of 1877 fasli. As to objections made at the time of its declaration see para. 1395.

1408. In the recent revision there had to be disposed of 127 petitions, relating to 102 villages in 30 maháls, on 81 of which, relating to 68 villages, in 21 maháls, the assessment was modified. The reduction amounted to 18·62 per cent. of the original demand on the pargana. The revisions took effect from 1283 fasli (1st July, 1875).

1409. The Government demand as it now stands (irrespective of progressive jamas, state-  
Demand ultimately fixed. ment Va.) is Rs. 94,470 land revenue,

or, including cesses, Rs. 96,831-8-0, its incidence being Rs. 2-0-6 per acre of cultivation. It is less than 8 per cent. in excess of the summary jama.

### PARGANA PACHHIMRATH.

1410. The largest of the thirteen parganas of the district, Pachhimrath contains no less than 349 square miles, divided into 502 villages. In one of these, Bikapur, are located the head-quarters of the present tahsíl of that name. The principal village is Muqimpur or Sháhganj, and eleven others have bazaars.

1411. The pargana is poorly provided with roads, especially on the east side, and though there are two or three railway stations, to help external traffic, a few miles off, on north and north-east, they are of course even for this purpose only available to those parts of the pargana with which there are means of communication.

1412. Of 115 máhals, 10 only are held by talukdars, but they contain 356 villages. Of these, however, 303 are sub-settled, so that just about three-fifths of the pargana is held by small proprietors or coparcenary communities. Revenue-free grants are comparatively numerous.

1413. The pargana has a population of 604 to the square mile, 77 per cent., or more than in any other part of the district, being agricultural. Mahomedans hardly exceed 4 per cent; high-caste Hindús are slightly above the average; so also are Ahírs; Kurmís are rather below it.

1414. Of the entire pargana, 56 per cent. is cultivated, 20 per cent is culturable waste, 6 per cent. is under groves, and 18 per cent is unproductive, a third of this being barren. The cultivation contains 58, 34, and 4 per cent. respectively of doras, matyár, and bhúr; 66 per cent. of it is irrigated (more than half from wells) and 34 per cent. is manured. "A fourth of the area ... being the portion of it through which the Biswi flows, is of light soil. The rest of the land is excellent and well cultivated, yielding a good rental." It is not uncommon for the crop statement to show half the rabi area wheat and a tenth cane.

Rates employed.

1415. The rates used in the assessment were—

	<i>Average rent-rates.</i>			<i>Class rates.</i>		
	Goind.	Majhar.	Pálo.	First.	Second.	Third.
	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
Old pargana ...	{ 6 1 7	3 11 10	1 11 2	4 5 0	3 10 0	3 3 0
	{ to	to	to	to	to	to
	{ 7 7 4	4 2 5	2 1 1	5 2 6	4 4 0	3 11 0
Transferred ...	{ 6 2 3	3 6 11	1 10 4	4 3 6	3 7 10	3 0 0
	{ to	to	to	to	to	to
	{ 6 15 2	4 0 9	1 12 9	4 12 0	3 14 6	3 6 6

The test jamas.

1416. The test jamas for the old pargana were:—

	Rs.
Soil ...	2,23,341
Deduced ...	2,19,082
Rent-roll ...	...
Class ...	2,18,476

1417. The result of the assessment was to fix the Government demand on the old pargana at Rs. 2,21,145, inclusive of cesses.

The corresponding demand on the present pargana was Rs. 2,62,200-9-10 land revenue, or, cesses included, Rs. 2,68,755-14-0. Its incidence was Rs. 2-1-3 per acre of cultivation, and it was 33 per cent. more than the summary jama, Rs. 1,96,996-12-4 (exclusive of cesses) It was declared on the 10th January, 1868, and introduced in 1277 fasli. Respecting objections made at the time, see para 1395.

1418. Of reasons given by Mr. Carnegy in the tahsíl report for such increase as took place in the Government demand (1) increased cultivation (para. 40), (2) increased rents (para. 41 ), (3) systematic assessment of waste, and (4) nominal

assessment of revenue assignment on account of cesses, the two last refer more particularly to this pargana.

1419. So far as the enhancement was due to the former of these two, it was admitted to be substantial, and it was represented by an addition of Rs. 12,150 to the Government demand. But, so far as it was the result of the assessment of muáfis, it was apparently implied that it was either nominal, or at all events less than the amount stated seemed to show. The reverse, however, rather appears to be the case. Perpetual muáfis are the only ones in which the assessment is likely to remain nominal for the whole of this settlement, and these, now assessed at Rs. 7,953, were at the summary settlement assessed at Rs. 5,229. On the other hand, several muáfis were at the summary settlement assessed at an aggregate sum of Rs. 12,785, which at the regular settlement was raised to Rs. 21,578. The apparent increase was therefore only about Rs. 8,800; the actual increase was Rs. 21,578 less the Rs. 7,953 on perpetual muáfis, or about Rs. 13,600.

1420. The number of petitions disposed of during the recent revision was 578. They related to 418 villages in 90 maháls, and on 377 of them the jamas were modified of 253 villages in 78 maháls. The reductions amounted to Rs. 7-8-10 per cent. of the former jama of the entire pargana, Rs. 8-11-6 of that part of it which came under examination, and as much as Rs. 13-5-8 per cent. of that part of it which was found too high. Progressive jamas were further allowed, as shown in statement Va.

1421. The causes of these comparatively large reductions cannot be explained in detail, but prominent among them may be noticed the assessment of waste land, and the fact that a large part of the pargana is included in the most troublesome estates, Mahdona, Kapradih, Sihipur (para. 1196) and Samrathpur (para. ).

1422. The revisions took effect from 1283 fasli (1st July, 1875). The Government demand, as left by them, is Rs. 2,42,408 land revenue, or, cesses included, Rs. 2,48,460-9-6, its incidence being Re. 1-11-9 per acre of cultivation. The difference

between it and the summary jama, Rs. 1,96,996, without cesses, is 3 per cent.

### PARGANA AMSIN.

1423. A small pargana, of oblong form, to the east of Haveli Oudh. With an area of only 99 square miles, it is divided into 180 villages. Its principal bazaar is at Goshainganj, and there are eight others.

Description of pargana.

1424. The Gogra runs all along the north of the pargana, and the railway cuts it from north-west to south-east; but its only roads are a section of that from Lucknow to Jaunpur, and branches from it east and south to Tánda and Bhíti.

1425. Of 180 villages in the pargana, 21 only are held by independent communities; but though the remainder are in talukas, all but 10 of them are sub-settled.

1426. The population falls at the rate of 604 to the square mile, 66 per cent. of it being agricultural. The only noticeable deviation from the district average is in the case of high-caste Hindús, and that is limited to an excess of 5 per cent.

1427. The cultivated area amounts to no less than 63 per cent. of the total area, a higher proportion than in any other pargana in the district; 14 per cent. is culturable waste; another 5 per cent. is grove land; and of 18 per cent. that is unproductive, only 4 per cent. is actually barren. The cultivation contains 63, 25, and 12 per cent. respectively of doras, matyár, and bhúr; 58 per cent. of it is irrigated (nearly two-thirds from wells) and 35 per cent. is manured. There are nine villages with manjhas.

1428. "The natural soils are good and level, but the non-laborious classes preponderate amongst the agriculturists, and the cultivation is therefore somewhat below the average. The talukdari tenure largely prevails, but the land has been extensively held by the ex-proprietary and contumacious

Barwárs, who are indifferent farmers and decidedly slothful rent-payers."

1429. The rates used in the assessment were as follows :—  
Rates employed.

Average rent-rates.			Class rates.		
Goind.	Majhar.	Pálo.	First.	Second.	Third.
Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
5 6 0	3 13 4	1 6 1	3 10 6	2 15 7	2 9 10
to	to	to	to	to	to
6 12 3	4 2 3	1 11 7	4 11 6	3 12 9	3 5 6

1430. It should be stated that in assessing this pargana Mr. Carnegy in several instances raised the class assigned to a village by the inspecting officer; the grounds for the alteration are not stated, but they were probably the manure and irrigation statistics.

1431. The test jamas for the old pargana were, inclusive of cesses:—  
The test jamas.

	Rs.
Soil ... ..	91,232
Deducted ... ..	88,324
Rent-rate ... ..	...
Class ... ..	82,595

1432. The result of the assessment was to fix the Government demand on the old pargana at Rs. 85,210, inclusive of cesses. Original demand. The corresponding demand on the present pargana was Rs. 78,043-4-0 land revenue, or, cesses included, Rs. 79,975. Its incidence was only Re. 1-9-8 per acre of cultivation, but it was 54 per cent higher than the summary jama, Rs. 50,447-15-6. It was declared on the 25th April, 1867, and introduced at the beginning of 1275 fasli.

1433. Whether any of the objections referred to in para. 1395 referred to this pargana I am unable to say; but, as in Akbarpur, the re-adjustment of rents after the introduction

of the new demand seems to have been attended with some difficulty.

1434. Mr. Carnegie was absent at the time, but in a memo. written after his return he says the complaints were only in Mahárāja Mán Singh's estate, and that talukdar's property in this pargana was formerly held by powerful and pugnacious Barwárs. These well held their own under native rule, and their claims to sub-settlement had not all been decided. In such cases it was proposed that the talukdar should go on collecting as before, but that when the rent was less than the Government demand, the talukdar should take that demand plus 5 or 10 per cent. It was also stated that the rent-schedule procedure had been different in this pargana as compared with others, and the Mahárāja's agent seemed to have taken advantage of the change in the settlement officership to create much needless confusion; he had issued notices to tenants of all classes to pay in future double the Government demand plus 8 per cent., "including those who think themselves sub-proprietors. In khám villages, in which there were no sub-proprietors, rents at double the Government demand were readily enough accepted."

1435. An European officer was accordingly deputed to visit every village in which either proprietor or sub-proprietor alleged over-assessment, and the conclusion he arrived at was that the demand was relatively fair and moderate. He assisted the proprietors to enhance their rents in the presence of the cultivators, and in no case was the enhancement objected to. In one instance birt and shankalp were found to be the cause of the difficulty, but it was admitted that, if the land were held by ordinary tenants, it would be equal to the Settlement Officer's estimate.

1436. In the recent revision there had to be disposed of 186 petitions relating to 149 villages in 23 maháls, on 107 of which the jamas of 83 villages in 17 maháls were modified. The reductions amounted to 5.65 per cent. of the original demand on the pargana, progressive jamas being also allowed to the extent shown in statement V $\alpha$ . The revisions began to take effect in 1284 fasli (1st July, 1876).

The revision.

1437. The Government demand as now fixed is Rs. 73,633 land revenue, or, cesses included, Demand ultimately fixed. Rs. 75,478-15-0, its incidence being Re. 1-8-3 per acre of cultivation. It is still nearly 46 per cent. more than the summary demand.

---

### TAHSIL BHARTIPUR.

1438. This tahsíl contained three parganas, Sultánpur, Isauli, and Khandansa, the two first of which have now been transferred to the Sultánpur district. The assessments were all introduced in 1870, and the report was submitted to the Commissioner on the 18th March, 1871.

1439. A further change was here made in the test jamas. Of the four originally employed, it has been seen the "plough" was discarded in the Fyzabad tahsíl, while deduced *data* were partially set aside, and a "soil" jama was adopted. In this tahsíl, the plough test not being revived, the soil test was retained; but the "deduced" was completely abandoned "because it was found that the results obtained by that calculation were so nearly identical with those obtained by the soil test that to retain both was waste of labour."

1440. Two of the original tests were thus abandoned, the soil test being substituted for one of them. The rent-roll test was still used, except in Khandansa, where the rent-rolls were condemned as "utterly unreliable." But regarding the assessment of that pargana I need only refer to the separate notice given further on.

1441. The original rule for the assessment of waste was still nominally maintained, but its application was very considerably relaxed.

---

### PARGANA SULTANPUR.

1442. A large pargana, with an area of 259 square miles, divided into 460 villages, in twenty Description of pargana. of which are bazaars. It is bounded all along the south by a navigable river, the Gumti, but its interior means of communication are somewhat scanty.



1443. The 460 villages constitute 103 maháls, of which 14, containing 287 villages, are talukas, and among them re-appear Mahdona, Kapradih, and Sihipur, already mentioned in para. 1421 in connection with pargana Pachhimráth. Of the remainder, 40 are held by single proprietors, and the rest, 133, by communities. Of the talukdari villages 127 are sub-settled.

1444. The population gives a rate of 601 to the square mile and 67 per cent. of it is agricultural. Beyond that the proportion of high-caste Hindús is 5 per cent. above the district average, details are not required.

1445. Of the total area of the pargana, 19 per cent. is unproductive, 6 per cent. being actually barren; 6 per cent. is occupied by groves, 19 per cent. is culturable waste, and 56 per cent. is cultivated. The last contains 70, 17, and 13 per cent. respectively of doras, matyár, and bhúr; 63 per cent. of it is irrigated, about half from wells, and 34 per cent. is manured. The southern portion of the pargana, that lying along the bank of the Gumti, is broken and intersected by ravines: the rest of it is level.

1446. The rates used in the assessment were as follows :—  
Rates employed.

Average rent-rates.			Class rates.		
Goind.	Majhar.	Pálo.	First.	Second.	Third.
Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
5 13 5	3 6 11	1 0 4	3 14 6	3 3 0	2 10 6
to	to	to	to	to	to
6 15 2	4 0 9	1 12 9	4 12 6	3 14 6	3 6 6

1447. With respect to waste, the rule for its assessment was nowhere rigidly enforced, and in one circle it was left altogether free.

1448. The test jamas for the old pargana were, inclusive of cesses :—  
The test jamas.

			Rs.
Soil	...	...	2,64,010
Rent-roll	...	...	...
Class	...	...	2,54,743

1449. The result of the assessment was to fix the Government demand on the old pargana at Rs. 2,59,425, inclusive of cesses.  
Original demand.

The corresponding demand on the present pargana was Rs. 1,91,613-6-1 land revenue, and cesses included, Rs. 1,96,404-3-7. Its incidence was Rs. 2-0-11 per acre, and it was 33 per cent. more than the summary jama, Rs. 1,44,392-14-3 (without cesses). It was declared on the 10th March, 1870, no objections being then raised, and introduced in 1278 fasli (the year, it will be observed, immediately preceding that in which the heavy floods occurred).

1450. The number of petitions disposed of during the recent revision was 410, and they related to 305 villages in 74 maháls; and on 215 of these the jamas were reduced of 151 villages in 48 maháls. The reductions made amounted to rather less than 5 per cent of the original demand on the pargana. They took effect from 1284 fasli, or 1st July, 1876.  
The revision.

1451. It will be observed that the result of the revision is much less marked in this pargana than in Pachhimráth, though some of the troublesome estates of the latter re-appear here; but on the other hand it has been seen that in the original assessment waste was more lightly treated here than in Pachhimráth, and other drawbacks, such as the large numbers of some of the coparcenary communities, also received more consideration.

1452. The Government demand as it now stands, irrespective of the progressive jamas detailed in statement Va., is Rs. 1,82,180 land revenue, or, cesses included, Rs. 1,86,736-9-5, being an increase of 126 per cent. on the Government demand. Its incidence is Re. 1-15-4 per acre of cultivation.  
Demand ultimately fixed.

**PARGANA ISAULI.**

1453. A small pargana, triangular in form, on the left bank of the Gumti, formerly occupying the south-west corner of this district and now combined with another of the same name in the district of Sultánpur. It remained unaltered by the territorial changes of 1869, and now, as before, has an area of 87 square miles, divided into 99 villages, in five of which are bazaars. It is very poorly supplied with roads, those marked in the map as running north-east and south-west from Isauli being little more than nominal. The Gumti is navigable all along the south.

1454. About a fourth of the pargana as measured by the number of villages or shares in villages, but only about a seventh as measured by the amount of revenue, is held by the talukdars of Samrathpur and Kurwár, principally the former. The remainder is divided between 49 maháls, of which 7, including between them only fractional portions of villages, equivalent in all to  $2\frac{1}{2}$ , are held by single proprietors, while all the rest of the pargana is in possession of (in some cases very numerous) proprietary communities.

1455. The population falls at the rate of 636 to the square mile, 55 per cent. of it only being agricultural. The proportion of Musalmáns is somewhat above the district average, partly owing to the town of Isauli, but partly also to the existence of a Musalmán branch of the Bhále Sultán clan. Kurmís are comparatively few; Ahírs are exceptionally numerous, being nearly 19 per cent. of the population.

1456. Of the total area of the pargana, 54 per cent. is cultivated, 21 per cent. is culturable waste, 18 per cent. is under groves, and 17 per cent. is unproductive, 6 per cent. being barren. The cultivation contains respectively 66, 20, and 14 per cent. of doras, matyár, and bhúr; 64 per cent. of it is irrigated (more than half from wells) and 37 per cent. is manured.

1457. "The natural soils," says Mr. Carnegy, "are the best in the tahsíl. About a sixth of the area is somewhat broken and undulating, the rest is flat and easily worked.

The pargana is divided into the high (uparwar) and the low (tarái) assessment circle, the latter being, if anything, the more productive of the two. The cultivation and the rents are not so high as the natural capabilities would seem to indicate that they should be, which is accounted for by the prevalence of high-caste husbandmen of the less laborious orders."

Rates employed.

1458. The rates used in the assessment were :—

Average rent-rates.			Class rates.		
Goind.	Majhar.	Pálo.	First.	Second.	Third.
Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
6 9 5	3 15 2	1 12 0	4 9 0	3 12 6	3 5 9
to	to	to	to	to	to
8 3 7	4 9 2	2 5 ~	5 10 6	4 10 9	4 2 0

The test jamas.

1459. The test jamas were, inclusive of cesses—

				Rs.
Soil	...	...	...	73,934
Rent-roll	...	...	...	...
Class	...	...	...	71,787

1460. The result of the assessment was to fix the Government demand at Rs. 72,073 land revenue, or, including cesses, Rs. 73,875.

Original demand.

This was an increase of 28 per cent. on the summary jama, Rs. 56,217-6-6 (without cesses); its incidence was Rs. 2-6-5 per acre of cultivation. It was declared on the 25th January, 1869, and introduced in 1278 fasli (1st July, 1870).

1461. No objections were raised when the new jamas were declared, but the assessment seems to have pressed very heavily upon the revenue-payers.

1462. Here, as elsewhere, no doubt, there were several things, besides an excessive demand, to interfere with the working of the assessment, and some of them were more felt here than in most

The revision.

parts of the district. Such, for instance, was the case with the non-completion of khewats, which were more generally, if not more urgently, needed than in most parganas. As in Sultánpur, again, the heavy floods of 1871 followed hard upon the introduction of the new demand, and the south of the pargana suffered severely from them. The river-circle is described as having been, when surveyed, "if anything, the more productive of the two" into which the pargana was divided. Many of the villages in it, however, were visited by Mr. Capper two or three years after the floods of 1871, and I quote the following passages from his notes. Regarding one village he says :—"The land is now very precarious. The old bed of the Gumti may at times be highly productive, but when I saw it much of it was spongy and waterlogged," and regarding another, "much of the land had not recovered from the effect of flood. The village was in a very poor way, and cultivation for the most part slovenly, with large patches of fallow. It would take capital and time to recover, and there is no capital among the Bháale Sultán owners." All the villages in which the revenue was reduced were again visited in 1876-77, and changes were then still pointed out which were attributed to the floods of 1871.

1463. Still, allowing for these circumstances, the assessment appears to have been heavy ; the reductions granted in the recent revisions were among the largest in the district. The number of petitions filed was 107, relating to 82 villages in 39 maháls, and on 69 of them the jamas were modified of 53 villages in 30 maháls. The reductions amounted to nearly  $8\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. of the original demand on the entire pargana and 13 per cent. of that modified.

1464. With the surface of what was the better part of the pargana so altered, it is difficult to form an opinion as to the suitability of the assessment rates at the time they were framed. It is, however, obvious that those rates were exceptionally high, and, though they are in part at least derived from jamabandis, it is not clear they were safe average rates. In the first place, though, even according to jamabandis admittedly correct, rents do in some places admittedly run very high, yet by the same showing also there are places where they run to the opposite extreme. And again, to the extent of a third of the pargana, the jamabandis are said to be

unreliable "owing partly to the prevalence of large cultivating communities and partly to mortgages at low rents," while most of the remainder is held by similar communities, and part at least of all their villages is sir and shankalp. There is but one taluka which contains any appreciable part of the pargana, and this is one in which rack-renting is the custom. The area from which safe rent-rates could be obtained is thus comparatively narrow.

1465. As in many other parts of the district, moreover, while the rates are those of ordinary tenants, they have been applied without distinction, both in the soil jama and in the correction of jamabandis, not only to lands held by such persons, but to sir and sub-tenures also.

1466. With respect to culturable waste too, though the "usual rule" was not strictly adhered to, it still added 4 per cent. to the Government demand, which on cultivation alone was already raised 24 per cent.; and while this was the percentage for the entire pargana, it was sometimes much exceeded in particular villages, even where they were poor and the rise was otherwise great.

1467. The Government demand, as now fixed, is Demand ultimately fixed. Rs. 65,972 land revenue, or, including cesses, Rs. 67,620-2-0. It is only about 17 per cent. more than the summary demand, but its incidence is still high, being Rs. 2-3-2 per acre of cultivation. It came into force, except where progressive jamas (statement Va.) were allowed, in 1284 fasli (1st July, 1876).

### PARGANA KHANDANSA.

1468. This pargana lies to the north of Isauli ; it contains an area of 117 square miles, divided into 128 villages, in 10 of which are bazaars. It touches the Gumti on the south-west, but for a few miles only, and it is poorly provided with roads.

1469. The pargana contains the head-quarters of one talukdar only, and his estate comprises but 11 villages ; 6 other villages are included in talukas. Six maháls, containing between them only three villages, are held by single

proprietors, and the remaining 108 villages belong to coparcenary maháls, of which the intricate character is noticed in para. 201.

1470. The population gives a rate of 631 to the square mile ; 70 per cent. of it is agricultural. High-caste Hindús exceed the district average by no less than 8 per cent. Musalmáns are few, though one of the talukdars belongs to this class. Ahírs are comparatively numerous, Kurmis are extremely few.

1471. Of the total area of the pargana, 56 per cent. is cultivated, 19 per cent. is culturable waste, 7 per cent. is covered with groves, 18 per cent. is unproductive, though only 5 per cent. is barren. The cultivation contains respectively 69, 21, and 10 per cent. of doras, matyár, and bhúr ; as much as 74 per cent. of it is irrigated (about half from wells) and 40 per cent., more than in any other pargana, is manured.

1472. Respecting the agricultural capabilities of the pargana, the tahsíl report says : "the natural soils are excellent ; the cultivation is of average quality, being largely in the hands of Bisens and Chauháns." In the appendix to that report, however, it is said "there is but one circle in this pargana. The soil is average doras, the surface is level. More than half the cultivation is irrigated ; the cultivation is fair." The latter description is, I think, the better of the two, it being understood, of course, the soil of the pargana is not exclusively of the kind here specified.

1473. In the broad statement made in para. 943  
 Method of assessment. about the system of assessment, it will be seen no exception is made with reference to this pargana. But though the same system may have been followed here as elsewhere in the district, there are some material differences in the manner of its application. The peculiar circumstances of the pargana did not escape notice, and some correspondence took place and memoranda were written of which the substance must now be briefly given.

1474. From a memorandum of the 6th February, 1869, drawn up by Mr. Carnegy shortly before he made over

charge of the settlement to his successor, it appears that part of the assessment data, including average rent-rates, had at that time already been prepared. The way those rates were obtained is thus shown.

1475. "The patwáris' rent-rolls of 1274 fasli for 103 villages have been examined. In the method of assessment adopted in this district one of the tests hitherto worked was the corrected jamabandi, but this is a test which it is hopeless to apply in this pargana, owing to the nature of the prevailing local tenure, *viz.*, the complex mahál in its most complicated aspect. Such jamabandis as are produced are mostly worthless, having been framed to mislead. Of all the jamabandis above indicated, those of 37 mauzas only have any appearance of reliability about them, and even these give results which are obviously below the mark; but, such as they are, average artificial soil rates have been deduced from them as follows:—goind Rs. 3-13-5, kaoli Rs. 2-2-4, pálo Re. 1-1-7, per Government bigah."

1476. These rates were applied to the "amín's soils," and a rough estimate of the Government demand made, which was further subjected to two tests—(1) comparison of the incidence of the demand with that on each of three adjacent parganas (one of these being Isauli, in which the incidence was Rs. 2-7-4); and (2), as more advisable, owing to the "mixed tenure of the teeming independent communities," comparison with the average incidence in the three.

1477. The assessment of the pargana did not take place, however, until the beginning of the succeeding year, 1870, when it was entrusted to the Assistant Settlement Officer. This was in January, and, towards the end of February, he received intimation that the new jamas must, without fail, be declared by the 14th of the next month. His notes supply me with a description of the method of assessment he adopted.

1478. "Dissatisfied with the reasons for a discrepancy in the area returns everywhere\* remark-  
\* e. g., In Pithla it amounted to bigahs 511 out of 1,753; in Akman, 759 out of 1,675; and Sirsind, 982 out of 2,548.  
 ed, and unable," owing apparently to the shortness of the time allowed, "to institute the minute enquiry which could



alone determine the proportion of tenants holding at favoured rates, the situation of their holdings, and the amount of favour shown them, I was unable to make, village by village, that correction of jamabandis, which was the basis of my assessments in pargana Mangalsi. I was able to do little more in my village inspections than compare the general features of neighbouring villages and check the entries of the amíns. Consequently, in assessing the basis of my assessments was a comparison of one village with another."

1479. The basis of the assessment being as thus described, four checks were constructed. The first of these was obtained by the application to the soils given by the amín of the rates paid by tenants-at-will, as shown by the papers of the 37 villages referred to in para. 1475. The second was a class-rate founded on the same rent-rates, which however, were for this purpose applied to manured and irrigated land, in the proportion in which each of the two former was necessary to constitute the class in which the village was placed. A third check lay in rates elicited on local enquiry by the assessing officer and the Sadr Mun-sarim. The fourth was an average revenue-rate derived from the correction of jamabandis of all the talukdari villages in the pargana. The first, second, and fourth, of these are shown in the No. II. statement as the amíns, the class, and the talukdars' jamas. The rates here referred to were:—

	Average rent-rates.						Class rates.											
	Goind.			Majhar.			Pálo.			First.			Second.			Third.		
	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.
Old pargana ...	6	12	3	3	6	11	1	12	1	4	3	6	3	7	10	3	0	0
Transferred ...	6	11	7	4	0	5	1	12	6	5	6	0	4	6	3	3	6	8

1480. With respect to waste lands, the rates in other parganas were 3 annas per acre on grazing lands and 13 annas on the remainder: in Khandansa, in view of the largeness of the rise, the character of the tenures, and the poor-

ness of the soil, a uniform rate of 3 annas per acre was in the first instance substituted, and ultimately, on the suggestion of the Settlement Officer, even the charge thus made was remitted, and waste lands were left entirely unassessed.

1481. The test jamas for the old pargana were :—

			Rs.
Soil	...	...	83,263
Talukdars	...	...	...
Rent-roll	...	...	...
Class	...	...	72,588

1482. The result of the assessment was to fix the Government demand on the old pargana at Rs. 81,255-6-0. The corresponding demand for the present pargana was Rs. 86,437-10-6, land revenue, or, cesses included, Rs. 88,600. The assessment of the pargana, as a whole, was found to be well within the limit given "by all the checks, except the class-rate, and this," says the assessing officer, "is to be accounted for by my reluctance to rank any village in a high class, unless it indubitably entered it." The assessment was further referred to another standard of comparison,—its incidence per acre,—the parganas by the incidence in which this was tested being the three named in para. 1476 and Rudauli in the Bara Banki district.

1483. The precise results of the assessment were only determined on the 13th March ; they were, however, as had been enjoined, declared on the 14th, with the intimation that they would begin to take effect from the commencement of the next fasli year.

1484. The increase in the Government demand was, Great enhancement of taking the pargana as a whole, 70 per cent. upon that of the summary settlement, Rs. 50,785 (without cesses), being much greater than this in some instances, and falling more heavily on coparcenary villages than on talukdari ones. Of 118 villages in the (old) pargana, the jama of 6 was reduced, and in 28 the increase was within 50 per cent. In 8, however, it was more than 75 per cent.: in 50 it was more than 100, and in 29 it exceeded 125.

1485. This was very much what had been anticipated; and Mr. Carnegie's memorandum had been written with the main purpose of putting on record that this was the case, of explaining the wide difference between the two demands, and of expressing his opinion as to the necessity for a progressive jama.

1486. "The summary jama," says Mr. Carnegie, "falls at the rate of Re. 1-3-5 on present cultivation. This was altogether disproportionate to the capabilities of the pargana, and did not secure to Government even a fourth of the assets. Enquiry shows that when this pargana was

\* It was then in that district. assessed by the Dariabad\* authorities, the cultivation was exceedingly backward, owing to the disputes of the Bisen and Chauhan communities, who greatly preponderate, and who were all at war amongst themselves. The consequence, of course, was that the real assets, owing to uncultivated land, were small, and such as they were, they were greatly understated by the patwáris." It seems probable, also, that the lowness of the demand is also to be in some measure traced back to the opposition the excessive numbers of the coparcenary communities enabled them, under native rule, to make to any attempted enhancements, just as the lowness of the former demand in Aldemau is explained to be due to "the powerful clanship of the Ráj Kumárs." Mr. Carnegie expected the rise to be about 86 per cent., and considered a progressive jama desirable.

1487. The assessing officer and the settlement officer both concurring in this opinion, the latter submitted a proposal that such a jama should be allowed. At the same time, however, he had to express his regret that "for the first time in this district dissatisfaction was expressed at the demand of the settlement officer. For a long time the zemindars *steadily refused* to attach their signatures to the revenue-roll, and they were only eventually prevailed on to do so on the distinct understanding that this would be considered no bar to a subsequent objection to assessment." The grounds of the zemindars' complaints were not that half-assets were exceeded; but that (1) the rise was enormous; (2) the

Objections.

proprietors were a numerous community ; and (3) they were given uncommonly short notice, and would be unable to meet the demand at the next kharif.

1488. The remedy for the first of these was the progressive jama recommended ; the second, it was believed, had received every consideration from the assessing officer. "Regarding the third," however, wrote the Settlement Officer, "I confess that I was unable to offer any explanation when I was repeatedly asked why Khandansa was to be differently treated from other parganas; why it was not to have the usual notice? I venture to think that it is greatly to be regretted that in this, perhaps the most difficult pargana of the district, time was not allowed for a more deliberate assessment, and that the Settlement Officer was permitted no discretion, but was compelled to announce that the revised demand would be enforced from a date which allowed landlords an utterly inadequate period within which to make their arrangements."

1489. A progressive jama by which the demand was temporarily reduced to Rs. 71,452-7-0 without cesses, or, cesses included, Rs. 73,240, was sanctioned by the Chief Commissioner in May, 1870, and in forwarding the sanction to the Settlement Officer, the Officiating Commissioner expressed himself quite willing to assume "the responsibility of seeing the new demand introduced at the ensuing kharif."

1490. Numerous objections to the assessment, extending to 63 villages, had been filed, but had been disposed of before the above instructions were received, and the new jamas were accordingly introduced at "the ensuing kharif,"—that of 1278 fasli.

1491. They were, of course, the progressive jamas only, in which an increase of 50 per cent. was not exceeded; and as the period for which they were granted was ten years, they still remained in force at the time of the recent revision. They had, nevertheless, only been collected with considerable difficulty, and the peshkar of the tahsil had for some years to be almost permanently located in this pargana.

1492. Not only can it not be said, however, that this was the result of the assessment, but it may be distinctly asserted that it was not so.

Reasons.

Notwithstanding the haste with which the assessment had to be made, a much slighter modification, even of the *full* demand originally fixed, was considered necessary in the recent revision than in any of the three neighbouring parganas, and in few cases only was the demand *till then in force* reduced.

1493. The reasons why that demand proved difficult of realisation are very much the same as those which led the zemindars to object to it at the time of its declaration. In the first place, liberal as was the concession that the immediate increase of a jama was to be limited to 50 per cent., it is evident that even such an increase, and it was common to the entire pargana, with the exception of 34 villages, must be very much felt by persons circumstanced as the zemindars of this pargana were (and are); and in the next place, there was the unusually short time given for making arrangements to meet the new demand; and, again, the great numbers of the proprietary communities (combined with the nature of the tenures) gave unusual importance to the non-completion in this pargana of khewats which were more wanted here than even in Isauli. There the maháls were at least fairly compact; here we have the "complex mahál in its most complicated aspect." Nor should it be forgotten that here, as in the other two parganas of the tahsil, the introduction of the new jamas was followed very closely by the heavy floods of 1871.

1494. With reference to this subject, it is remarked in the Government Resolution concerning the revisions in this pargana, that, "it is stated that the difficulty experienced in realising the assessments introduced in 1870 was principally due to the fact that those assessments, representing a greatly enhanced demand, were suddenly imposed in full on a community whose individual rights as sharers, superior proprietors, or subordinate holders, had not been defined. This view is supported by the test of experience, which has amply justified the objections referred to in the reports now under consideration of the Settlement Officer, who pleaded that the revised demand should be postponed until progress

had been made with the record of rights, but who was overruled, mainly, it is believed, on the ground of financial exigency."

1495. I now come to the revision of the assessment, about which, however, I shall have very few words to say, as it was carried out in the same way as in other parganas. For various reasons, which need not be detailed, the lines of the original assessment were not followed.

The revision.

1496. The number of petitions disposed of during the revision was 141, relating to 102 villages in 96 maháls, and on 81 of these the jamas were modified of 58 villages in 85 maháls. The reductions amounted to 6·81 per cent. of the original demand. For reasons given in the pargana revision report no progressive jamas, other than those from the first in force, were allowed..

1497. The Government demand, as it now stands, is Rs. 80,549 land revenue, or, cesses included, Rs. 82,563, its incidence being Re. 1-14-8 per acre of cultivation. It is still nearly 59 per cent. in excess of the summary jama. In the few cases in which the revisions altered the demand previously in force it took effect from 1285 fasli (July, 1877); in all other cases they will come into force when, but for them, the full regular assessment first made would have been levied, *i.e.*, 1288 fasli (July, 1880). The demand from 1285 fasli to 1287 fasli is Rs. 70,389 land revenue, or, cesses included, Rs. 72,135-4-0; from 1288 fasli it becomes, as above, Rs. 82,563.

### THE DISTRICT.

1498. It still remains to show the results of the assessment for the entire district, and this must be done in two ways—firstly, for the district as at present constituted, this being convenient for future use and reference; and secondly, for the entire settlement district, this being necessary in order to include the whole area of which the settlement is reported.

(a) Present district.  
(b) Former district.

### PRESENT DISTRICT.

1499. The present district is in form approximately a parallelogram, of which the north, one

Description.

of the longer sides, rests on the Gogra. It has an area of 1,689 square miles, comprising 2,569 villages, in rather more than a hundred of which are bazars (para. 72). It is traversed nearly diagonally by the Oudh and Rohilkhand Railway, of which it contains eleven stations. With roads it is, on the whole, rather poorly provided. The Gogra and part of the Tons are navigable.

1500. Of the 2,567 villages in the district, 694, or rather more than a fourth, are held by petty proprietors or proprietary communities; and though 1,873 are held by talukdars, no less than 1,341 are sub-settled. Thus there remain only 532, or a little more than a fifth, held by talukdars in single proprietorship.

1501. Five villages or portions of villages belong to Government, of which two—Fyzabad and Ajudhya—are exempted from assessment; seventeen tracts were formerly demarcated as grants, of which, however, some have since been resumed. There are 109 villages on the bank of the Gogra exposed to fluvial action, and 37 villages contain manjhas.

1502. The total population of the district is 1,063,820, giving a rate of 630 to the square mile, and 65 per cent. of it is agricultural. Musalmáns form 10 per cent. of the total population, high-caste Hindús (Bráhmíns and Chhattris only included) 24, and the principal agricultural low castes (Kurmís, Muraos, and Ahírs) 6, 3, and 12 respectively.

1503. Of the total area of the district, 56 per cent. is cultivated, 16 per cent. culturable waste, and 5 per cent. covered with groves; 13 per cent. is unproductive, being occupied by habitations and tanks; and 10 per cent. is barren. Of the cultivated area, 58 per cent. is doras, 31 matyár, and 11 bhúr; 58 per cent. of it is irrigated, rather less than half from wells, and 27 per cent. of it is manured.

1504. The rates used in the assessment of cultivation, excluding the exceptionally high ones of the small Fyzabad circle (para. 1391), were as follows :—

Rates employed.

Average rent-rates.*			Class rates.*			Remarks.
Goind.	Majhar.	Pálo.	First.	Second.	Third.	
Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	
5 6 0	3 6 11	1 6 1	3 10 6	2 15 7	2 9 10	*These do not include the special rates on Fyzabad and its suburbs; see para. 1392.
to	to	to	to	to	to	
7 7 4	4 12 10	2 8 5	5 6 6	4 9 6	3 14 4	

1505. In the assessment of waste land the same rates were maintained throughout, *viz.*, 3 annas per acre on as much as was estimated to be required for grazing purposes, and 13 annas per acre on the remainder, but this rule was often relaxed (para. 996). Groves in excess of 10 per cent. of total area were treated as culturable waste.

1506. The test jamas cannot be given here, as has been done with individual parganas, as one of them only, the class jama, was used throughout; and even this has not been calculated for the area to which the present remarks refer.

1507. The result of the assessment was to fix the Government demand at Rs. 12,35,801-12-7 land revenue, or, cesses included, Rs. 12,66,703-6-10, the incidence of which was Rs. 2-0-8 per acre of cultivation and Re. 1-9-5 per acre of malguzari area. It was an increase of 42 per cent. on the summary demand.

1508. In the recent revision there had to be disposed of 3,071 petitions, relating to 1,896 villages in 445 maháls, and on 1,644 of these the jamas were modified of 1,015 villages in 362 maháls. The reductions amounted to Rs. 6-10 per cent. of the original demand on the district, 7-75 per cent. of that on the villages which came under objection, and 13-69 per cent. of that on the villages in which reductions were made. Progressive jamas were also allowed to the extent shown in statement Va.



1509. The Government demand as now fixed is Rs. 11,60,462 land revenue, or, cesses Demand ultimately fixed. included, Rs. 11,89,478-11-0, its incidence being Re. 1-14-8 per acre of cultivation and Re. 1-7-10 per acre of malguzari area. It is still a rise of more than 33 per cent. on the summary jama, Rs. 87,00,098, without cesses. Owing to progressive jamas, however, it will not be levied in full until 1293 fasli (1st July, 1885).

### THE SETTLEMENT DISTRICT.

1510. The settlement district is, roughly speaking, an irregular quadrilateral figure, of which Description. the Gogra and the Gumti form two, the north and south, sides. It is very narrow on the west, but widens gradually towards the east. Containing an aggregate area of 2,344 square miles, it is divided into 3,601 villages, in about 130 of which are bazaars (para. 72).

1511. The old district is in many respects similar to the new, but for convenience sake the same statistics will be here separately given for the former, as have been already given for the latter.

1512. With respect to means of communication, as the railway is included in those of the smaller area, it is, of course, included in those of the larger, but, at the same time, with the exception of a few miles of it without any station in pargana Aldemau, it is confined to the former. What was said of the former—that it was rather poorly provided with roads—is equally, and perhaps more, applicable to the latter. To the Gogra and Tons, as the navigable rivers in the former, may be added also the Gumti in the latter.

1513. Of the 3,601 villages in the old district, 1,187, or about a third, are held by petty proprietors or proprietary communities, and of the remaining 2,414 held by talukdars, 1,713 are sub-settled, so that only 701, or less than a fifth, are held by talukdars in single property.

1514. Five villages or portions of villages belong to Government, the only ones exempted from assessment being the two, Ajudhia and Fyzabad, in the present district. The

number of demarcated "grants" was originally 22, including those which have since been resumed. There are 109 villages, including those only on the banks of the Gogra and the Gumti, exposed to fluvial action: 37 contain manjhas.

1515. The total population of the district is 1,440,957, which gives an average of 614 to the square mile, and 66 per cent. of it is agricultural. Musalmáns form rather more than 9 per cent. of the total population; high-caste Hindús (including only Bráhmíns and Chattrís) 25, and the principal agricultural castes (Kurmis, Muraos, and Ahírs) 6, 3, and 12 respectively.

1516. Of the total area, 55 per cent. is cultivated, 17 per cent. is culturable waste and 5 per cent. is under groves, 13 per cent. is occupied by habitations and tanks, and 10 per cent. is barren. Of the cultivated area, 61 per cent. is doras, 23 matyár, and 16 bhúr; 58 per cent. of it is irrigated, rather less than half from wells, and 27 per cent. of it is manured.

1517. The rates used in the assessment were:—

Average rent-rates *			Class rates.*			Remarks.
Goind	Majhar.	Pálo.	First.	Second.	Third.	
Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	
5 6 0	3 6 11	1 6 1	3 10 6	2 15 7	2 10 6	*These do not include the special rates on Fyzabad and its suburbs; see para. 1392.
to	to	to	to	to	to	
8 0 0	5 0 0	2 5 7	5 12 0	5 0 0	4 4 0	

1518. The rates applied to waste land were the same as in the present district (para. 1505).

1519. It was explained in para. 1506 that the test jamas could not be given there, as has been done with individual parganas, even in respect of the "class" jama, which was used throughout the assessment. This last, however, can be given here, as the totals for the old parganas, together, make up the total area at present under consideration; it was, inclusive of cesses, Rs. 17,45,259.

The test jamas.

1520. The result of the assessment was to fix the Government demand at Rs. 17,22,363-2-8 land revenue, or, cesses included, Rs. 17,65,429-10-5, its incidence being Rs. 2-1-3 per acre of cultivation or Re. 1-9-9 per acre of malguzari area. It was more than 42 per cent. higher than the summary jama.

This demand was declared at various times between the 6th April, 1865, and the 14th March, 1870, and was introduced at various times between 1273 and 1278 fasli.

1521. In the recent revision there had to be disposed of 4,175 petitions relating to 2,645 villages in 666 maháls, and on 2,382 of these reductions were made in the jamas of 1,506 villages in 544 maháls. These reductions amounted to 6 per cent. of the original demand on the entire district, about 8 per cent. of that portion of it which came under examination, and about 14 per cent. of that part of it which was modified. They began to take effect at various times between 1282 fasli (1st July, 1874) and 1285 fasli (1st July, 1877).

Remarks concerning the results of the revision.

1522. A few remarks are necessary concerning these results.

1523. First as to petitions. The above figures show that about 43 per cent, or rather less than half, were rejected, and 57, or rather more than half, admitted;

1524. At the outset it appeared that "many, very many, of the petitions were frivolous," and some, no doubt, turned out to be so; but, on the other hand, many of those probably alluded to were not eventually found to bear out the *prima facie* impression they had created, and among these were two rather large classes, *viz.*, those in which the total jama of the holding under objection was apparently a very paltry sum, and those in which two or more petitions were filed about the same village.

1525. The first of these two classes finds justification in the nature of the tenures of the district, and I think its real significance is that the revenue-payers here find it necessary to complain of what elsewhere would not be felt. Many

maháls, small in themselves, are composed of portions considerably smaller (para. 201), and if the owners did not work through these, they would be debarred from obtaining any relief at all. If the proprietor of a compact mahál, comprising (say) one entire village assessed at Rs. 200, were to petition that his jama be reduced to Rs. 180, his application would not be thought unreasonable; and if the proprietor of a mahál assessed at the same sum, but composed of portions lying in ten or a dozen different villages, were to file separate petitions for each portion, it is obvious that, though his petitions might individually seem absurd, he is of the two the more entitled to consideration. In the recent revision distinction was drawn, as far as possible, while the mauzawar assessments were under examination, between such cases and those in which one or two small holdings formed parts of an otherwise compact mahál; and for this purpose I kept by me a memo. showing in one line for each mahál the number of whole mauzas and the number of parts of mauzas it contained, together with its aggregate jama. Where there were petitions of the latter kind only, they were, as a rule, rejected.

1526. With respect to the second class of cases, those in which there were two or more petitions about the same village, this plurality was often due only to the sub-division of the village. The instances in which one petition was exceeded in a single mahálwar fraction of a village were very rare and were even then probably by different people,—the proprietor and mortgagee for instance.

1527. Next, as to mauzawar results, it is enough to say they show about the same percentages as petitions.

1528. The results for maháls, on the other hand, are materially different, for in no less than 80 per cent. of the maháls under objection was the assessment modified. This, however, is not an unnatural consequence of the mauzawar assessment, combined with the sub-division of villages between different maháls, for, while the alteration of an assessment affects but one mauza, it may, and often does, affect several maháls; and while a mahál may comprise several villages or portions of villages, the alteration of the jama of

any one of its component parts necessarily alters the jama of the whole.

1529. Nor do I think the number of maháls in which the jama was modified could advantageously have been reduced. It has been seen that in the mauzawar revisions endeavours were made to avoid all unnecessary changes, and the same course was continued in writing up the mahál files.

1530. As a consequence of the limited scope of the revision, indeed, all the parts of a mahál did not usually come under examination, and even as between those that did, under-assessment in one could not always be set off against over-assessment in another ; but, where possible, this was done, and if the two were evenly balanced, the Government demand was left unaltered. In other cases, again, though in the mauzawar proceedings no reductions amounting to less than 5 per cent. were proposed, it sometimes turned out, when the whole mahál came under consideration, that so small a proportion of it was affected that the total reductions contemplated formed an inappreciably small percentage of its jama. Here, where possible, the reductions were cancelled.

1531. The reservations above made are necessary, because the cancellation of reductions was not always feasible or expedient. The only portions of maháls affected were, perhaps, sub-settlements or villages, in all but the revenue engagement (para. 1690), quite distinct from the remainder of the mahál, and even where this was not the case, alteration of figures was found liable, in complicated tenures, to create confusion.

1532. Lastly, there is the amount of the reductions made. These were equivalent to 6 per cent. only of the former jama ; and had the over-assessment which this implies been rateably distributed over all villages alike, and had the recent reductions been so too, there would not have been much relief afforded, nor would there have been much pressure to relieve. But while the reductions amounted to 6 per cent. only of the total original demand, they reached 14 per cent. of that part of it which has undergone modification ; and it thus follows that, while the loss to Government

is small, the relief afforded to individual maháls at first heavily assessed is far from inconsiderable.

1533. The Government demand, as it now stands, irrespective of the progressive steps  
*Demand ultimately fixed.* detailed in statement Va., is Rs. 16,11,059 land revenue, or, cesses included, Rs. 16,51,342-3-5, its incidence being Re. 1-15-2 per acre of cultivation and Re. 1-8-1 per acre of malguzari area. It is still an increase of 33·31 per cent. on the summary land revenue demand, Rs. 12,08,551.

1534. The instalments in which the Government demand is to be paid were not fixed by  
*Revenue instalments.* the Settlement Department, and they are liable to variation; but it will not be out of place to give here a list of those at present in force. They are as follows :—

	annas.		annas.
October 15th	... 2	April 1st	... 3
December 15th	... 3	May 15th	... 3
February 1st	... 3	June „	... 2

1535. The period fixed for the duration of the assess-  
*Duration of settlement.* ment is thirty years from the introduction of the original demand; this, as above shown, varying from 1273 fasli (1st July, 1865) in pargana Aldemau to 1278 fasli (1st July, 1870) in the three parganas of the old Bhartipur tahsíl.

#### *Section IV.—Record of Rights.*

##### PART I.—JUDICIAL.

1536. Judicial work commenced in different parganas on different dates, which may be regarded as those of the notices prescribed by  
*Judicial work.* Settlement Rulings 5 and 16, calling upon all claimants of rights in land to come forward within  
*Date of commencement.* one month. These notices, which were issued as soon as the survey of each pargana was sufficiently advanced, were dated as follows :—

Name of pargana.	Date of proclamation.	
	30 days.	15 days.
1. Sultánpur ... ..	4th September, 1868	30th March, 1869.
2. Isauli ... ..	7th December "	15th March "
3. Aldemau ... ..	12th February, 1863	19th May, 1863.
4. Akbarpur ... ..	1st October "	21st June, 1865.
5. Birhar ... ..	4th February "	16th July "
6. Majhaura ... ..	27th July "	19th September, 1863.
7. Surharpur ... ..	15th September "	20th May, 1864.
8. Tándá ... ..	10th June, 1865	21st July, 1865.
9. Amsin ... ..	12th October, 1866	25th February, 1867.
10. Pachhimráth ... ..	21st November "	9th November, 1867.
11. Haveli (Judh) ... ..	1st June, 1868	23rd July "
12. Khandansa ... ..	7th December "	...
13. Mangalsai ... ..	10th December 1867	...

1537. It was originally directed that, on the decision of all claims thereupon instituted, other notices should be issued to the effect that, except on special grounds, no claims would be admitted after the expiration of a further period of fifteen days. This order was very soon cancelled, however, and suits continued to be admitted until the district was formally declared to be no longer under settlement. This took place on different dates. With regard to the three parganas now included in the Sultánpur district, viz., Sultánpur, Isauli, and Aldemau, they not only belong to another district, but also to another division—that of Rae Bareli. As soon, therefore, as the revision of assessment was completed, and there remained nothing but the single tie of judicial work to connect them with this district, it was recommended that they should cease, for judicial purposes, to be under settlement. These recommendations were approved and the requisite notifications were issued in January, 1877, for Aldemau, and in the following August for Isauli and Sultánpur. In the ten parganas, forming the present Fyzabad district, the Settlement Courts retained their jurisdiction till the end of September, 1878, or till just a month before the department altogether ceased to exist.

1538. While this was the case, however, it is material, as affecting the completeness of the Record of Rights, to point out that, even Settlement jurisdiction not exclusive.

for the shorter of the periods above named, the Settlement Courts had not exclusive jurisdiction. Certain cases and classes of cases were from time to time transferred to the ordinary Civil Courts. In 1865, for instance, suits for land not assessed or assessable to revenue (an important class, as it was judicially pronounced to include all suits relating to the two cities of Ajudhya and Fyzabad) were declared cognizable only by those Courts, as were in 1867, most suits in which the cause of action arose, or the claimant had not had possession after the summary settlement; and shortly afterwards the Rent Courts were invested with powers to decide questions of right arising in suits before them. In 1870, again, it was ordered that, when once the settlement records of a village were ready to be placed in the hands of the binder, all suits in that village should be referred to the ordinary Courts, and after the introduction of Act XXXII. of 1871, section 26 of the Act was for a time brought into play. There were then grounds for hope that all suits pending in the Settlement Courts might be disposed of and the courts closed by the end of the succeeding year. This hope, however, it is now almost needless to say, was not realized; and at the beginning of 1874, as a large influx of suits took place, in consequence of the measure described in para. 1541, it was directed that all those instituted in the Settlement Courts should be tried there, and transfers to the ordinary Courts were discontinued.

1539. The Settlement Courts were at first "Courts of Civil Judicature;" by Act XVI. of 1865 they became for a time Courts of Revenue; by Act XXXII. of 1871 they became Civil Courts again. At first the Settlement Officer and his assistant only were invested with judicial powers. In a short time, however, extra Assistant Commissioners were entrusted with the decision of claims to groves, and by the end of the year 1865-66 the powers of those officers had been enlarged, and Sadr Mun-sarims had begun to be employed in a judicial capacity. Jurisdictions were at first defined by classes of cases, pecuniary limits being substituted by Act XXXII. of 1871.



1540. Suits were admitted on plain paper from the opening of the Settlement Courts until sufficient time was considered to have been allowed for their institution. The exemption from court fees was then withdrawn, the dates from which the withdrawal took effect being those given below :—

1. Haveli Oudh	...	...	1st April 1870.
2. Mangalsi ...	...	...	Ditto.
3. Amsin ...	...	...	Ditto.
4. Pachhimráth	...	...	Ditto.
5. Khandansa	...	...	1st May, 1871.
6. Akbarpur...	...	...	29th December, 1868.
7. Tánda ...	...	...	Ditto.
8. Birhar ...	...	...	Ditto.
9. Majhaura...	...	...	Ditto.
10. Surharpur	...	...	Ditto.
11. Aldemau ...	...	...	Ditto.
12. Sultánpur...	...	...	1st January, 1871.
13. Isauli ...	...	...	Ditto.

1541. From these dates full court fees were levied until the beginning of 1874, when it was discovered that, in "Fyzabad and some other districts, the privilege of filing plaints free of stamp duty for rights to be recorded in the settlement papers had been too soon withdrawn. The result was that the status of many subordinate holders remained undefined, and was not recorded in the settlement papers; and thus the difficulty of working the revised assessments was much increased." To remedy this state of affairs, the Government of India "was pleased to reduce the court fee on suits for a declaratory decree, in respect of any underproprietary right, from Rs. 10 to Rs. 8, and it is thus in the power of either the superior landlord or the subordinate holder to secure at a moderate cost a judicial declaration of the condition of each subordinate tenure."

1542. The total number of suits disposed of by the Fyzabad Settlement Courts was 71,728, or much more than twice as many as in the most litigious of the other districts in the province of which the Settlement reports have yet been published, and it was thus very great, both absolutely and comparatively.

Amount of litigation.

Sultánpur	...	26,043
Partabgarh	...	20,736
Rae Bareilly	...	22,693
Lucknow	...	27,139
Nitapur	...	17,290
Bahraich	...	7,496
Unao	...	12,658
Very great.		

1543. As the enormous amount of litigation in the Fyzabad district has frequently formed the subject of remark, the result above described is not more than might have been expected. The explanation of it is to be found in several causes, some of which were peculiar to this district, while others, though common to other districts, also operated more widely here than elsewhere.

Reasons.

1544. One of these causes was the extra period for which the Settlement Courts were kept open, in consequence of the revision of assessment, and this produced the greater effect, because the low fee on declaratory suits was then in force. About 9,000 cases were instituted during that period.

1545. Another cause is furnished by the size of the district, though the rate per square mile (here 30), is far higher than in any of the other districts above named. A third cause was the denseness and notorious litigiousness of the population, and a fourth was the intricate nature of tenures. A fifth, the effect of which was increased by the fact that it worked in combination with the fourth, was the "note" system (para. 1570) based on the directions to revenue officers, according to which, where a suit affected two or more villages, a note was made in the records of each. This system, which in many districts would very slightly, if at all, affect the number of cases, in a district like this, increases it considerably.

1546. Again, undistinguished among "all others" in the judicial statement are some hundreds, if not thousands, of Rent Act suits, objections to notices of ejectment, and claims for adjustment of rent. Many suits of these kinds were tried by the Settlement Courts in other districts, but they appear to have been exceptionally numerous in this. It seems also that these suits sometimes had duplicates under other heads, such as *sir* or *shankalap*.

1547. In one of the annual reports I find it suggested that many claims owed their origin to the action of pleaders, and in another it is stated that the "vakils of Fyzabad had of late been using their best endeavours to gain a

footing in the Settlement Courts." It is, however, added that "they had met with no encouragement," and I do not know that Fyzabad was more unfortunate in this respect than other districts.

1548. Of the whole amount of litigation part was, no doubt, as remarked in the Financial Commissioner's report for 1864-65, merely nominal, having for its object only the formal decree which was indispensable for the entry of a right, even though undisputed, in the settlement records. This, however, was common to the entire province, not peculiar to the Fyzabad district.

1549. At one time also (in 1870) it appears there was reason to suppose that "the large number of cases instituted in Fyzabad" was "unduly increased by the splitting-up of suits and a complicated system of transfer from one court to another. But, though to some extent, when subordinate rights were claimed, the plaintiffs were referred to separate suits for sir and other rights, it is clear from printed reports and circulars that the practice was more or less general throughout the province, and also that it was one which it was rather advisable to limit than interdict entirely; and though enquiry was made as to the large number of cases which had attracted notice, the result was to satisfy the Financial Commissioner that the "apparently enormous litigation in Fyzabad was real."

1550. In connection with this subject it should be noticed that in his report for 1868-69 the then Settlement Officer, *proprio motu*, drew attention to the fact that in the registers the same cases had sometimes appeared twice or more, and thus inordinately swelled the totals. Steps had, however, been taken, it was said, to eliminate such cases, large numbers having been struck off, and it was hoped the entries in the annual returns were then correct. Nor, after this, does there seem to have been any reason to doubt the accuracy of the returns, except on one occasion, when it was found that khationi orders had been included in them. These however, so far as I am able to ascertain, did not go beyond some of the final orders in "misl taqsim" cases, of which there were in all 1,181 only.

1551. From the foregoing remarks it will be seen that a larger and even proportionately larger number of suits was due to the system of record in this district than in many others ; but, on the other hand, it will also be seen that besides this there were other amply sufficient reasons for an unusually great amount of litigation.

1552. The procedure followed in the disposal of suits was, generally speaking, that laid down in the laws and circulars from time to time in force, but, more particularly during the earlier years of the settlement, it possessed a distinctive feature in the systematic efforts made to effect an amicable adjustment of disputes, the Fyzabad Courts, as is well known, having been more successful in this respect than those of any other.

Procedure.

Amicable adjustment and compromises.

1553. " From the moment of entering upon settlement duties," says Mr. Carnegy in the annual report for 1863-64, " I have been guided by what I consider the imperative necessity of working as much as possible through the people themselves ; of associating the talukdars and larger zemindars with the department in all arrangements ; of considering myself as the physician to whom the delicate task has been assigned of healing the many sores that repeated changes of system, since annexation, have created between the superior and inferior holders of the soil, the peacemaker whose duty it is to reconcile the most discordant elements ; and I have devoted myself by exhortation, by kindness, and, where necessary, by sternness, earnestly to overcome all difficulties and to create none. I have never adjudicated a sub-proprietary case until I had first failed in bringing the parties together, knowing full well that to decree a sub-proprietary claim in Court is to sow the germs of a never-ending enmity."

1554. This statement, however, is made in connection with sub-tenures, being principally applicable to them, and the subject is one which will be more appropriately left till those tenures come under notice. It will suffice here to state that, of the total number of cases decided, in 26 per cent. the decisions were passed on compromise and consent.

1555. While compromises were thus numerous, arbitration, except in so far as it formed part of the compromise procedure, was not at all popular.

1556. With regard to the other modes in which cases were disposed of, as during the greater part of the settlement the institution of suits was (owing to the low court fee) easier than in the ordinary Courts, it might perhaps have been expected that the dismissals for default would have been comparatively more numerous. They amounted, however, to about  $5\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. only, which is much lower than the average for some years past in the ordinary Courts.

1557. Of the cases decided on trial, a little less than half were decreed, and a little more than half dismissed. The number of cases, however, in which the claimant wholly or partially succeeded is to be measured by the total of compromises and decrees on trial, and these together amount to about 56 per cent. of the grand total.

1558. Proceeding to details, statement VI. shows that, of the 71,728 suits decided, only 5,059 refer to proprietary right, 13,614 to shares in either superior or subordinate tenures, and 53,055, or close upon three-fourths, exclusively to subordinate tenures.

1559. First, with respect to Proprietary Right. In talukdari villages, though the superior title was protected by sanad, instances were not wanting of claims to that right. What was usually intended, however, was a claim to sub-settlement only, and when such was the case the claimant was allowed to amend his plaint in the real sense of the claim.

1560. In non-talukdari villages there were generally one or more claims to proprietary right, and they were often numerous. In those exceptional cases in which no claimant at all came forward the initiative was at first taken by the Settlement Department, Government being made plaintiff, as it was considered essential that a decree should issue in regard to every village. This order was afterwards

cancelled, however, and it was directed instead that "all claims to full or superior proprietary right in entire villages must be brought against the Government as defendant."

1561. All claims, where more than one, to a village or any particular part of it were at first taken up together, one single record being formed. This however, owing to the extreme difficulty of bringing all the parties and their witnesses together when wanted, was found to lead to confusion, to get rid of which each claim was for a time separately taken up. This in turn was found to entail a good deal of additional labour, and "the following plan, an improvement upon the original one, was adopted :—All claims of the same nature in a village were taken up at the same time; each had a distinct number, and was carefully indexed on the fly-leaf; all the proofs were kept apart according to cases; one kánúngo's report, one reply by the defendant, and one judgment did for the whole village, and each case had its separate decree. Where the same pleadings and particulars applied to several villages, the record of enquiries was made with reference to the principal or parent village, and a note was filed with the papers of all the other villages, referring to it for details."

1562. Under this head are included three classes of suits which call for special notice.

1563. The first includes suits by talukdars for villages not in their sanads. In respect of these, the talukdar came into Court on the same footing as ordinary proprietors. So comprehensive, however, were the lists attached to the agreement or kabuliat executed by the talukdars at summary settlement that 20 claims of this kind only were decreed.

1564. A second class consists of those in which a village was under native rule included in a máhal, not a taluka; but the original proprietor, without in any way alienating his right, continued to retain possession, in subordination to the owner of the máhal, until annexation, and perhaps during the summary settlement, and at the present settlement came forward to assert a claim to the superior right. Here, where the inclusion of the village in the máhal took place within

limitations, the claim was always decreed. But where it occurred beyond that period, the plan adopted in the earliest cases taken up, with the view of maintaining the *status quo* before annexation, was to decree a subordinate's right to the original proprietor. It was subsequently ruled that sub-proprietors could not be recognized in non-talukas, and some few decrees that had been passed were brought under review and reversed, and it was directed that the proprietary title should be decreed exclusively to one party or the other, as the case might be. Ultimately, however, this principle was relaxed, and it was conceded that if the party under engagement had received any appreciable beneficiary interest for a period beyond limitation, it should be continued to him, while at the same time the position of the original proprietor was maintained.

1565. A third class of cases consists of those in which villages were declared the property of Government. This is extremely small; it was only in about one-third (the non-talukdari portion) of the district, indeed, that such cases were possible. The villages decreed to Government were the following:—

- |                    |                 |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| 1. Tendha Pavasur. | 4. Bāgh Bijesi. |
| 2. Birahimpur.     | 5. Alamau.      |
| 3. Jhāta.          | 6. Asaf Bāgh.   |
| 7. Irwal.          |                 |

1566. Of these, the first three only were retained in the hands of Government; the last three were restored either to the persons found in possession or to the old proprietors; the fourth was made over to the nazul department, subject to the payment of the ordinary revenue demand. The list above given does not of course include mauzas (among which are Ajudhya and Fyzabad) or parcels of lands of which the nazul department was already in possession.

1567. The total number of claims to proprietary right preferred was 5,059, or, though two-thirds of the district is talukdari, more than the number of mauzas in the whole of it. The claims did not all extend to entire villages, however, but were often for máhal shares only, and the number of these shares is 6,763.

1568. There is not the same room for compromise in cases of this sort, where one or other of the disputants usually had exclusive possession under native rule, as in sub-proprietary cases, where both parties had concurrent possession, and in 89 only of the former did the parties come to terms. "Petty zemindars," says Mr. Carnegy, speaking of cases of this kind tried in 1868, "if they escaped the usurpations of others under native rule, were not usually powerful enough themselves to encroach; what they held, therefore, in those days was generally their own, and they consequently retain it under us. This accounts for the large proportion of summary settlement awards shown above, 59 out of 64 remaining undisturbed." This proportion was not maintained, however; in no less than 2,526 cases, or, as nearly as possible, one-half of those instituted, were decrees passed in favour of claimants, and apparently the possession of summary settlement disturbed. This looks as if at that time the ownership of villages was very uncertain (though it may be doubted whether the decrees do not include some (and perhaps many) which, under the procedure described at the end of para. 1560, were in favour of the persons actually in possession); but it may with confidence be asserted that it has now been clearly determined, there having been 32 cases only relating to it within the last seven years.

1569. In connection with suits for subordinate tenures a few remarks which refer to all classes  
 (2) Sub-tenures. of them alike are wanted before they are separately noticed.

1570. Of the course pursued in the investigation of these rights the following account is given by Mr. Carnegy:—"I began," he says, "by directing all the talukdars of the district to prepare lists of all parties on their estates whom they knew to have sub-proprietary claims." Such lists are among the means mentioned as open to Settlement Officers to obtain information regarding subordinate rights in Circular No. 46 of 1863; but Mr. Carnegy states that the practice was in force in this district before the issue of that circular. In these lists rights which were admitted were to be detailed separately from those that were contested. "Several meetings were convened, and the subject in all its bearings was



repeatedly discussed and explained, and in due time the lists were filed. In the admitted claims, the parties either presented themselves or were sent for, and their rights judicially recorded. The contested claims and all others that were filed and not acknowledged were brought to issue, and I may state that many of these also were admitted after the lists were given in."

1571. "Great pains," Mr. Carnegy says elsewhere, apparently with regard to contested cases, "were taken to induce parties to endeavour to come to terms amongst themselves. Where they came to an adjustment, the same was reduced to writing and a decree by consent was briefly recorded. When the issues were confined to narrow limits, the parties were exhorted to compromise, and any of their compeers who were in attendance were desired to aid them in doing so ; and it was only when these means failed that contested cases were disposed of by the Fyzabad Settlement Court."

1572. The litigation, it is said, during the currency of the summary settlement was unusually great, and this by sickening people of law paved the way for compromises at the regular settlement.

1573. These remarks were made regarding the Dostpur tahsil, but they also hold good for the entire district, with the exception of a single pargana, Birhar ; and Birhar alone, to judge from the prominent place it occupies in the annual reports, was slow to welcome the mission of the peace-maker. In consequence of the ill-feeling between the talukdar and the subordinate holders, difficulty had been foretold in this direction by the Commissioner, Mr. Simson, and Mr. Carnegy, in spite of his previous success at first, entertained fears that Mr. Simson's prediction would be fulfilled. But "after much litigation and futile exhortation," says Mr. Carnegy, "I appointed the committee marginally named to try and bring the parties to reason. This committee brought the litigators together and in fact made a short enquiry in regard to each village, and I am happy to say their labours were eventually attended with

Mir Ghazaffar Husain.  
Babu Jaidat Singh.  
Babu Chandrez Singh.  
The parganah kánungo.

a large measure of success." The talukdars filed revised lists by which 80 claims were admitted.

1574. The number of sub-tenure cases compromised was 15,566. The talukdars to whom praise seems to have been considered to be most due for their conciliatory disposition were the late Mahārāja Sir Mán Singh of Mahdona and the late Bábu Rámsarup Singh of Kapradih.

1575. "The relief that has resulted to the parties themselves and to the presiding officers from this procedure," says Mr. Carnegy, "is incalculable; and the subject has been on different occasions favourably noticed by the Commissioners, Messrs. Simson and Mayne." And to this, moreover, it may be further added that the procedure referred to received also the commendation of the Supreme Government. "Wherever," it is said in a letter of the Foreign Secretary written in 1865, "the temper of the parties will admit of an agreement between themselves for the recognition of proprietary right, such a course is deserving of every encouragement, and the Settlement Officer of Fyzabad is fortunate in having to deal with circumstances which have allowed him such success in procuring the termination of disputes by amicable arrangement out of Court."

1576. The most important, though not the greatest number, of the decrees by compromise and consent were passed in the Settlement Officer's Court, and though exact details are not forthcoming for each officer, the following table will furnish them approximately:—

*Detail of compromises in Settlement Officer's Court.*

Official year.	Number of compromise.	Settlement Officer.
May, 1863, to April, 1864 ...	233	With the exception of a few months now and then, Mr. Carnegy was Settlement Officer until March, 1869.
" 1864, ditto 1865 ...	351	
" 1865, ditto 1866 ...	747	
" 1866, to Sep., 1866 ...	158	
Oct., 1866, ditto 1867 ...	70	
" 1867, ditto 1868 ...	133	From March, 1869, Captain Erskine. From July, 1870, Mr. Woodburn. From March, 1872, Mr. Ferrar. Ditto ditto. From April, 1875, Mr. Millett.
" 1868, ditto 1869 ...	194	
" 1869, ditto 1870 ...	50	
" 1870, ditto 1871 ...	2	
" 1871, to Dec., 1872 ...	1	
Jan., 1873, ditto 1874 ...	4	
" 1875, to Oct., 1878 ...	1	

1577. Of subordinate officers, the following are those who exceeded the district average of 26 per cent., and against their names are shown the percentages they reached. Far first comes Hasan Ali, Sadr Munsarim, 60, and after him Ali Husain Khan, Extra Assistant Commissioner, 48; then come Mr. Nicholson and Munshi Harprashad, Extra Assistant Commissioners, 38; then Chiranji Lal, Sadr Munsarim, 33; and then Munshi Shioprashad, Extra Assistant Commissioner, and Mohan Lal, Sadr Munsarim, 27.

1578. In para. 1541 it has been seen that, owing to the too early withdrawal of the exemption of Settlement suits from stamp-duty, the institution of claims to sub-tenures for a time received a check, which was at last removed by the notification reducing the court-fee on such suits; and though suits under the notification were not so numerous as had been anticipated, they were sufficiently so for it to be evident that the concession had been a substantial benefit to many of those in whose interest it was proposed.

1579. The total number of cases in which subordinate rights were decreed was 53,055, the area awarded to sub-proprietors being 438,611 acres out of a total of 1,017,951. The profits intercepted by the sub-proprietors on these lands are, according to statement VII., Rs. 3,10,218 against Rs. 5,34,651 received by the talukdars. Both these sums, however, are somewhat below the mark, as in that statement the total profits are estimated as equal only to the Government demand, while, as that demand has sometimes been fixed at less than half assets, they are really in excess of it. Owing, moreover, to the manner in which the rents of sub-proprietors are generally fixed, the under-statement here alluded to is greater with respect to their profits than those of the talukdars.

1580. Different classes of suits for sub-proprietary rights have now to be noticed separately.

1581. Of claims to sub-settlement in talukas the total number was 6,237, among which, there being no other place for them in the periodical returns, were included those of the kind mentioned in para. 1381, in which the talukdar took the initiative.

Sub-settlement.

A case gained by the ex-proprietor was entered as a sub-settlement decree, and one decided in favour of the talukdar was entered as dismissed.

1582. Of these claims 1,171 were settled by compromise or consent, 668 were withdrawn or allowed to go by default, and 4,398 were decided on trial.

1583. The principles followed with respect to the last-named cases are thus described in the note referred to in para. 182 :—

1584. “In conferring proprietary right upon the talukdars, Lord Canning stated that they were granted subject to any measures which the Government might think proper to take for the purpose of protecting the inferior zemindars and village occupants from extortion, and of upholding their rights in the soil in subordination to the talukdar. In answer to the Chief Commissioner’s objections the Governor-General further stated that he did not see how the talukdars could with any show of reason complain. The zemindari tenure, intermediate between the tenures of the talukdar and the ryot, is not a new creation, and it is a tenure which, in the opinion of the Governor-General, must be protected.” The Chief Commissioner subsequently issued a circular and a ruling which were the first to guide settlement officers in determining the right to hold entire villages in subordination to a superior holder. These rules were as follows :—

1585. “The head of a former proprietary body may have held an uninterrupted lease of the entire village (held it *pucka* as the phrase is). Leases of this kind must be distinguished from mere casual farming leases (*mustajiri*) at varying terms. The Chief Commissioner does not think that any term of possession can be fixed as determining the right to hold *pucka*. The Chief Commissioner believes that the question can only be decided by reference to the previous history of the village from the time it came into the taluka. If it has been held *pucka* from that day, few talukdars would dispute the right of the occupants to a continuance of the tenure. The circumstance of the village having once or twice been held *khám* by the

talukdar would not, even in his estimation, necessarily invalidate the right to hold *pucka*. Again, in Settlement Ruling No. II. the Chief Commissioner remarked that rights to sir and náńkár are quite another thing from the right to enjoy a lease of the village otherwise than at the pleasure of the talukdar. In his review of the Settlement Report for 1863-64, the Chief Commissioner observed that the principle for determining a claim to hold *pucka* is that the claimants must for a reasonable time have held, if not a permanent lease, yet such a position as shows that the management and control of the village affairs was entirely in their hands."

1586. "A judicial decision by the Financial Commissioner in 1865, however, eventually brought about an entire reconsideration of the qualifications to be required in under-proprietors of talukdari villages, prior to a decree entitling them to sub-settlement being passed in their favour. The result of the discussion is embodied in the Sub-Settlement Act No. XXVI. of 1866 and the Financial Commissioner's interpreting circular No. VI. of 1867."

1587. Under the provisions of this Act, not only were all subsequent claims to be governed by it, but all cases previously decided became open to review, and of these there were 2,462. Owing, however, to the construction that had been placed in this district upon the rules above quoted, and the number of cases decided by agreement (and therefore not liable to be re-opened), the effect of the Act, either upon original decisions or upon those passed on review, was almost inappreciable. On the subject of review the office records do not furnish much information; but, so far as I can ascertain, there were 15 cases only in which an application was even presented. And as to original decisions, from an analysis made by Mr. Woodburn of 444 cases disposed of by him in the latter half of the year 1866-67, it appears that his decision had not been "influenced in more than 17 by the special regulations of the Act and the circulars subsequently issued." In two instances only was the claim thrown out for want of proof of the requisite margin of profits, and in one of these a decree was given on appeal.

1588. At first the decision of sub-settlement cases was looked upon as complete without the determination of rent.

This, however, was soon found to lead to inconvenience, and by Settlement Ruling No. 13 it was laid down that the question of rent was to be disposed of simultaneously with that of right.

1589. The one question like the other was frequently settled by compromise, and agreements were then taken, judicially confirmed, and put with the record. These were generally to the effect that the parties would "divide the profits according to the gross rental accepted by the assessing officer, and after payment of the Government demand, with patwáris' and chaukidars' dues, the balance will be at the disposal of the parties in the proportion of one-half each, or seven annas and nine annas, or any other proportion mutually agreed upon, the arrangement to hold good during the currency of the revised settlement."

1590. This at first sight seems satisfactory; but while, as here shown, the rent was to be based on the Government demand, or the assumed rental on which it was fixed, the rent had also, according to the rules in force, to be determined before the Government demand was declared; and it will thus be obvious that two things which could only be done (completely) in succession had to be done at the same time. A way out of the difficulty was found in the indefinite agreement above described, and thus, though compromises were effected, it was unfortunately necessary to leave in them a blank to be subsequently filled in with an amount of which not even a rough estimate could be formed. The sub-proprietors, therefore, had to take a leap in the dark, and they complain that it did not land them at all where they expected, while in many cases it is clear that their rent was raised much more than it would have been under the ordinary operations of the rules on the subject. This is one phase of the "judicial over-assessment" referred to in para. 1037, and it is mentioned both on that account, and also because compromises have not always worked well: and in this is probably to be found one of the chief causes.

1591. Where the parties did not come to any agreement about the rent, it had to be determined at first in accordance with Settlement Ruling No. 13, which is based on the relation between assessments under English and Native rule.

" But in order to the literal obedience of the instructions there given, it was necessary that the king's demand on each mauza should be known. But a talukdar's contract with the Native Government was usually fixed at a lump sum on an estimate of the entire yield of the taluka, and the ruling was in many cases inapplicable. A special correspondence on this subject took place, and finally the Sub-settlement Act laid down that in all sub-settled villages the rent of the under-proprietor should bear the same proportion to the present gross rental of the village as his rent under the king's administration bore to the then gross rental."

1592. These being the rules for the determination of sub-proprietors' rents, it is necessary to allude briefly to the manner in which they were applied in certain cases, as this was another cause of "judicial over-assessment." Where, as sometimes unfortunately happened, village papers were not forthcoming, it was almost hopeless to attempt to supply their places by oral evidence; and probably on this account other means were resorted to for the ascertainment of the former gross rental. Of these, the two most common in vogue, more especially towards the beginning of the settlement, were as follows.

1593. In some instances, the assessing officer's gross rental being taken as showing present assets, a certain proportion, say one-third, was cut off as representing the improvement under our rule, and the balance was accepted as showing assets previous to annexation. The effect of this procedure was to raise the sub-proprietors' rent (in the example given here just 50 per cent.) where, for anything on the record, it should apparently have remained unaltered. It is, indeed, stated in the Dostpur report that "it is well established by enquiring.....that the cultivated area has increased.....since annexation; but whether this be accurate or not as a general statement, it can hardly be otherwise than dangerous to apply it to individual cases without individual enquiry. This is more particularly the case, also, with villages in which sub-settlement has been decreed, as in these possession was little disturbed under native rule, and not even the average extension of cultivation probably has since taken place.

1594. In other instances again, though it is plainly stated in the Dostpur report and elsewhere that the "summary assessment was unjustifiably low," the fact appears to have been overlooked where, as was sometimes the case, it entered into the calculation of sub-settlement rents. The assets on which the summary assessment was based were treated as having been actuals at that time, and also as accurately representing the gross rental under native rule. They were accordingly compared with the gross rental assumed for the regular assessment, and the difference regarded as due to improvement in the interval. The result was to cause a proportionate increase in the sub-proprietor's rent, for which, if what is said at the beginning of this paragraph had been kept in view, it would have been perceived there were scarcely sufficient grounds.

1595. The rent having been fixed, on whatever principle, a printed statement was filled in and attached to the sub-settlement file. This was of two kinds, known as BB and CC. The latter was used where the terms on which the sub-proprietor was to hold had been settled by agreement, and showed the conditions of the agreement, the gross rental, the Government demand, the wages of patwári and chaukidar, the distribution of profits between the talukdar and the sub-proprietor, and the rent payable by the latter. Form BB was used where the rent had to be entirely determined by the Court, and showed the rent and gross rental (known or assumed) under native rule, similar data for the present time, the Government demand, the wages of patwári and chaukidar, the distribution of profits, and the total rent payable by the sub-proprietor.

1596. The number of sub-settlement cases decreed was 1,171. They include 1,713 villages, with an aggregate area of 347,264 acres and rental of Rs. 7,91,584, the Government demand being Rs. 4,95,687, while of the profits (assumed as equal only to that demand, see para. 1579), against Rs. 1,52,849 received by the talukdar, the sub-proprietors intercept Rs. 2,33,048. Their number being 24,000, this gives them an average of Rs. 9-11-4 each.

1597. The number of these cases dismissed was 4,159. But at the same time this does not mean that in all of them the



claim was absolutely and unconditionally rejected ; in some the order of dismissal was qualified by the reservation of certain rights to the plaintiff. In those, for instance, brought by persons " who, with strong equitable claims for consideration, have no case in law," the most suitable form of relief was pronounced in the Financial Commissioner's report for 1868-69 to be an hereditary farming lease, and with regard to this Mr. Carnegie writes :—" There is no denying the old proprietors dislike the provision of the law which gives the sîr only when their profits were small. They infinitely prefer a *profitless* lease of the whole village, which enables them to reserve the shadow of their positions to a *profitable* tenure extending over a tenth or a fifth of the area only." There are 30 sub-mahâls in which this tenure has been decreed, 16 of them being in the Mahdona estate.

1598. In other cases again, while possession in any shape of the entire village ceased to be assured to the ex-proprietors, the order dismissing their claim provided that they should obtain sîr yielding a profit equal to not less than one-tenth of the gross rental. And there were other similar cases also in which, though no particular percentage of profits was specified, some arrangement was made about the sîr of the whole sub-proprietary body. No register was kept of cases of this kind, so that I am unable to state their number.

1599. There remain to be added those " hard cases" for which special provision is made in Financial Commissioner's Book Circular IV. of 1867. It does not appear that any such cases were made the subject of report, and there were few, I believe, to which the rules were applicable.

1600. Claims to sub-settlements in non-talukdari mahâls in all numbered only 136, and of these no more than 55 were decreed, 9 by compromise and 46 on trial. The mode in which these cases were dealt with has been explained in para. 1564. Act XXVI. of 1866, as was ruled soon after it was passed, was not applicable to them.

1601. In one of his reports Mr. Carnegie advocated the issue of special rules for the disposal of these cases, principally

with reference to the party who should be admitted to engage for the Government demand. But the Financial Commissioner, though he looked upon Mr. Carnegie's proposals as "sound and practical," did not consider it advisable to publish them for general observance. Nor does there appear to have been in this district any deviation from the ordinary rule that the superior proprietor is admitted to engage for the revenue.

1602. Shares, though constituting a distinct class of cases, which is mentioned here in accordance with the place assigned to it in statement VI., pervade all, or very nearly all, of the tenures which form the subject of other classes. It is only necessary here to point out that under this head are included not only claims to entire shares, but also those to parcels of land as forming parts of shares.

1603. The general rule concerning *sir* is that the ex-proprietor is to have "any amount of such land that he held at any time within the twelve years preceding the annexation of the province, and on the most favourable terms enjoyed by him within that time."

1604. At first, with a view to carrying out the order that all rights should as far as possible be ascertained and recorded when a suit for sub-settlement was rejected, the parties were questioned about *sir*. Still claims of this nature were for some time very few in number, and the circumstance was noticed as general throughout the province in the Financial Commissioner's report for 1867, where it was also remarked that, even so far as the zemindars had come forward, they had not been so successful as might have been anticipated. The Supreme Government thereupon desired that it might be ascertained what were the causes that, with the *sir* rules so favourable to ex-proprietors, led to the failure of so many claims.

1605. For this district the reply was submitted by Mr. Carnegie, who represented that the objection did not seem applicable to the results obtained here. Of the claims that

had been disposed of. 498, close upon three-fourths were shown to have been decreed, and, as partially explaining the failure of the remainder, it was pointed out that it was not an invariable rule that ex-proprietors got sîr on losing their village, and that, even where they did so, they were perhaps reduced to the condition of tenants-at-will long before annexation.

1606. The fewness of the claims was not touched upon (there being no occasion for it), but it will be seen there had been no more than 498. The principal reason for this was, doubtless, that they were kept back until sub-settlement claims had been decided, and another reason is perhaps to be found, when sub-settlement disputes were over, and had gone against the zemindar, in his unwillingness, in the face of a recent defeat, to risk his luck in Court again.

1607. Later years made up for any deficiency there may have been at first in the number of suits for sîr, for altogether as many as 6,731 were instituted. But the proportion of decrees stated by Mr. Carnegy was not maintained; the number of cases disposed of by compromise or consent was only 819, or about 12 per cent. of those instituted, and of those decided on trial little more than half were decreed. In all 53 per cent. only of the claims terminated in favour of the ex-proprietors, or not much more than elicited the Financial Commissioner's comments in 1867. It would, therefore, appear that the results here shown are not what might have been anticipated, but I am not aware of any special reasons that led to them.

1608. The nature of the tenure decreed varied ; sometimes it was heritable and transferable, sometimes the power of transfer was withheld (para. 238).

1609. With respect to rent, when the land decreed had formerly been held rent-free or at a low quit-rent, the former terms were in some instances maintained ; but even then, when the land amounted to an entire village or the share of a mahâl in a village, a provision was, in accordance with a ruling of the Financial Commissioner, entered in the administration paper, declaring the liability of the sub-pro-

prietor, should the proprietor fail in his revenue engagement ; and the rule more generally followed, except in cases of special agreement, was that all land was made subject to a minimum rent of the Government demand plus 5 or 10 per cent.

1610. The total area decreed as sîr, dihdâri, and das-want (and this includes all lands so decreed, whether in suits for these rights or in any others) is 39,646 acres, the rental being approximately Rs. 1,63,979, out of which the decreeholders retain Rs 65,024. To complete the list of lands awarded to ex-proprietors those held on an "occupancy" tenure must be added. These include 11,118 acres, with an estimated rental of Rs. 45,826, the rent paid on them being Rs. 41,398. Thus, exclusive of sub-settlements, the lands decreed to ex-proprietors amount to 50,764 acres, with an approximate rental of Rs. 2,09,805, of which the sub-proprietors intercept Rs. 68,912. What average this represents for each sub-proprietor I do not attempt to say, as the number who take under the decrees (in which the name of one only of several sharers may be given) cannot be stated with sufficient accuracy to make the calculation of any value.

1611. With regard to birt and shankalp cases, I quote  
(b) and (c) Birt and shankalp. again from the memorandum mentioned in para. 182 :—

1612. " The decision of the claims to purchased birt was clear from the commencement of settlement operations. It was directed by the Record of Rights Circular that these should be maintained as representing the proprietary right of the ' birtîās, who by purchase have acquired the position of intermediate holders.' Birts granted by the original owners of a village before incorporation in a taluka have also been upheld, unless the talukdar had resumed them prior to the limitation period.

1613. " The purchased shankalp was at first ruled to be a redeemable tenure, but this direction was shortly so far relaxed that the Settlement Courts were permitted to decree or refuse the right of redemption according to the custom prevailing in the district.

1614. "There remained the class of unpurchased birts and shankalps. As has been said, these were treated at first as tenures which the superior had the right to resume at his pleasure. The legal position of the holders of these tenures was long uncertain. In 1868, the Financial Commissioner issued a series of decisions which have since guided the Courts in the determination of all these cases. It was left for the decision of the Court in each case, whether by the custom of the neighbourhood, if not from the express terms of the contract, the tenure was resumable, and if not, whether it was heritable or transferable. As regards rent, if a claimant sues for a rent-free tenure, he must prove that he is entitled to hold rent-free, and that he so held in the years 1262-63 fasli (1855-56 A.D.). In this case his position rent-free is upheld for his life, but his heirs are liable to pay the Government revenue assessed on his land. If the tenure is a rent-bearing one, the former rent is maintained with these provisos, that it is not less than the rent actually paid in 1262-63 fasli, nor less than the Government revenue plus 10 per cent.

1615. "The general custom of the district as regards resumption has been described above. The uncertainty of the law relating to these tenures prevented any large number of them being decided in the earlier stages of the settlement; but at all times the claimants of birt and shankalp have had their rights very freely admitted by the superior."

1616. Yet another change than those described above took place in the law relating to these and other low-rented tenures in 1876, for, by Act XVII. of that year, a proprietor is under certain conditions permitted to resume unpurchased grants.

1617. The total number of birt and shankalp cases was 4,363. Of these 1,168 were compromised or decreed by consent and 1,360 decreed on trial.

1618. All that is necessary under this head is to specify the principal classes of cases it includes, these being sayar, marwat, right of occupancy (para. 1610), and adjustment of rent, and to state that it embraces a larger number of decisions by compromise and

(d) All others.

consent than any other class in talukas. Out of a total of 21,195 cases 7,244 were disposed of in this way.

1619. "In other maháls" are repeated very much the same kinds of suits as "in talukas," and  
 (2.) In other maháls. the only circumstance that requires notice with regard to the former is that, while petty proprietors disputed every claim to sub-settlement, many of which were admitted in talukas, they far outstripped their taluk-dári brethren in their readiness to admit claims to other sub-tenures. Of 14,393 cases under this head, 5,155, or nearly 36 per cent., were compromised or decreed by consent, the full number decreed being 9,215.

1620. Statement No. VI. exhibits only suits tried by Courts of original jurisdiction. It thus excludes the appellate branch of judicial work, and it may therefore be stated that from first to last 5,088 appeals were disposed of by the Settlement Officer.

1621. This statement, in showing the number of cases decided by the Settlement Courts, does not necessarily imply that when the Courts were closed a clear file was left, nor is this what actually occurred. At the same time, up to a month before the closing of the Courts, such a result had been confidently looked for. There were pending at the earlier date only 229 cases, and these might have been decided in the interval that remained. No sooner, however, had the notification required by Act XXXII. of 1871 (which appeared in the *Gazette* of the 31st August, 1878) been issued than a great number of new suits were instituted, and the consequence was that 691 remained pending when the Courts were finally closed at the end of the following month.

---

## PART II.—FORMATION OF THE RECORD.

1622. The Settlement records are partly Mauzawar and partly Parganawar.  
 The Settlement records.  
 (a) Mauzawar; (b) Parganawar.

1623. The Mauzawar records consist of two parts, the Judicial volume (misl haqqiat) and the Settlement volume (misl bandobast or kishtwar).

Mauzawar records,  
(a) Judicial, (b) Settlement.

### JUDICIAL.

1624. There is a separate Judicial volume for each village, with the exception of those few, where there were not any suits. In such cases, in order to prevent doubts as to its having been lost, its place has been supplied in some districts by a memorandum, bound up in the usual kind of cover ; here no record of any kind has been formed.

Judicial volume.  
For each village.  
Exceptions.

1625. The Judicial volume does not profess to hold all the files relating to the litigation that went on during the Settlement. Two reasons for this have been already given (para. 1538). Another is that, when the revival of litigation caused by the reduction of the court fee on declaratory suits took place, the records of many villages had been already handed over to the district office, and, after discussion of the subject, it was thought inexpedient to disturb them. For one thing, the inclusion of the new files in the Settlement volume was not all that would have been required ; if this had been carried out it would have entailed amendment also of the papers of the Settlement volume wherever a decree was issued. Again, even where the records still remained in the Settlement office and were unbound, it was obviously impossible to close them, where there was still a chance of their being affected by fresh cases, and a date was therefore fixed by the direction of the Commissioner, cases instituted after which were to be excluded from the bound records. At the same time, in order to prevent confusion, wherever any cases were so excluded, a detailed list of them was prepared and attached to the Judicial volume of the village.

### SETTLEMENT.

1626. The Settlement or Kishtwar volume has been prepared in duplicate for every village, one copy for the district and the other for the tahsil office. The latter copy,

Settlement volume.  
For each village.  
In duplicate.

however, has omitted from it two or three of the papers to be found in the former.

1627. The kishtwar volume of the principal village of a mahál contains various papers peculiar to it, such for instance as the khewat and kabuliat. It sometimes happens, however, that a mahál consists of parts lying in different parganas, and here each parganawar part of it has been treated as a separate mahál. A distinct name, taken from one of its villages, has been assigned to it, *e. g.*, Mahdona, which bears its own name in Pachhimráth, becomes Bharti-pur in Sultanpur and Bhaukauli in Khandansa, and each such village has, for the preparation of records, been treated as the principal village of a mahál.

1628. The system on which the Settlement record is formed is not uniform throughout the district. At first that of the North-Western Provinces, with the alterations made in Circular No. 23 of 1864, was adopted; but before long a modification of the more recent one introduced by Mr. E. A. Prinsep into the Panjáb was substituted for it. On which of these two systems the records of each pargana are drawn up is shown in the following lists :—

<i>North-Western Provinces.</i>	<i>Panjáb</i>
1. Surhampur.	1. Haveli Oudh.
2. Majhaura.	2. Mangalsi.
3. Aldemau.	3. Amsin.
4. Sultanpur.	4. Pachhimráth.
5. Isauli.	5. Khandansa.
	6. Akbarpur.
	7. Tánda.
	8. Birhar.

1629. The first three parganas constituted the tahsíl, Dostpur, in which settlement pargana operations first commenced, and one of these, Aldemau, and the two last, are those which were transferred to the Sultanpur district, where the old system was adhered to.

1630. First, with regard to the North-Western Provinces system, the papers of which the mauzawar record should consist are



specified in Circular No. 23 of 1864 ; those of which it actually consists are slightly different. A list of both is given in the subjoined table, and the differences will be subsequently explained.

<i>Actual contents.</i>	<i>Circular No. 23 of 1864.</i>
1. Fihrist, or list of papers.	1. Shajra.
2. Misl hadbast, or demarcation proceedings.	2. Khasra.
3. Shajra kishtwar, or field map.	3. Shajra abádi.
4. Khsra kishtwar, or field book	4. Khasra abádi.
5. Shajra abádi, or map of village site.	5. Fard cháhát.
6. Khasra abádi.	6. Jamabandi.
7. Fard cháhát-o-toláb, or list of wells and tanks.	7. Khationi.
8. Khationi No. I.	8. Statement No. II.
9. Ditto No. II.	9. Khewat, or statement No. III.
10. Misl taqsim, or partition proceedings.	10. Darkhwast or kabuliat.
11. Khewat.	11. Schedule of rent arrangements.
12. Kabuliat, or revenue engagement.	12. Wajib-ul-arz.
13. Tasfiya lagan, or schedule of rent arrangements.	13. Rubakár akhír.
14. Wajib-ul-arz, or administration paper.	
15. Abstract of cultivators (occasional only.)	
16. Rubakár akhír, or final proceeding.	

1631. According to Mr. Prinsep's system, in its original form, the settlement record is divided into three parts, of which one, the second, does not refer to individual villages, but to entire parganas. They are—

The Panjáb system.

- (1) The Misl Bandobast.
- (2) The Misl Riwáj-i-am.
- (3) The Misl Muta'arriq.

1632. The introduction of this system into the Fyzabad district was, in the first instance, recommended by Mr. Carnegie, and a report was thereupon called for as to the feasibility of adapting it to Oudh. This report was submitted in 1868 by Captain Forbes, then Officiating Settlement Officer, by whom several modifications were proposed.

1633. As the system was finally adapted to this district, the misl riwáj-i-am was retained as a separate record ; but the other two misls were formed into one, some of the component parts of each being discarded.

1634. As arranged by Mr. Prinsep, the contents of these two misls were as follows :—

<i>Misl Bandobast.</i>	<i>Misl Mutafarriq.</i>
1. Fihrist kaghazat misl.	1. Rubakári.
2. Khasra.	2. Naqsha kami-o-beshi.
3. Shajra kishtwar.	3. Fard badr.
4. Shajra nasb mai khewat.	4. Naqsha tasfiya hukúk
5. Darkhwast malguzári.	5. Khasra abádi.
6. Fihrist radifwar malikan.	6. Shajra abádi.
7. Muntakhab or khationi.	
8. Naqsha chahat.	
9. Naqsha tashkis jama muáfiat.	
10. Rubakár akhír	

1635. One of the former and some of the latter were pronounced superfluous in this province, while, on the other hand, the addition of certain other papers was recommended. No mention was made of the Misl Hadbast, this not being strictly one of the Settlement papers, but it does not seem to have been intended to exclude it from its usual place in the volume with them.

1636. The misl bandobast, in the form it ultimately assumed then, contains—

1. Fihrist sighawar.
2. Misl hadbast.
3. Shajra kishtwar.
4. Khasra kishtwar.
5. Shajra nasb malikan mai khewat.
6. Fard radifwar malikan.
7. Khationi I.
8. Ditto II.
9. Fard kami-o-beshi.
10. Misl taqsim.
11. Fard cháhát-o-taláb.
12. Shajra abádi.
13. Khasra abádi.
14. Kabuliat.
15. Tasfiya lagan.
16. Rubakár akhír.

1637. The new system had been introduced into one pargana, Tánda, at the time the report concerning it was written, and it thereafter continued to be applied to all others, with the exceptions noted in para. 1629.

1638. The composition of the settlement volume in both its different forms has thus been described. Individual papers will now be, as far as necessary, noticed, those of the old series and the corresponding ones of the new being taken up together ; those peculiar to the new series are only the "fard radifwar malikan" and the "fard kami-o-beshi," which are sufficiently explained in paras. 1676 and 1684.

1639. The Fihrist is, according to the older system, simply what its name denotes, a list of Individual papers .  
(1) List of papers. the papers in the record ; that of Mr. Prinsep's system is much more elaborate, and contains not merely a list of papers, but also many particulars relating to the village. These convey much useful information in a condensed form, but it appears to me that it would have been better to make them the subject of a separate paper, and leave the list unencumbered with any entries but those proper to it. A sign-post serves its purpose better by merely furnishing in a clear and distinct form the names of places, and the way to get to them, than if it contained also topographical accounts, which, however interesting in themselves, tend to make the names of the places less easily distinguishable.

(i) Misl Hadbast. 1640. The Misl Hadbast, or demarcation proceedings, require no comment.

1641. The preparation of the Shajra has been almost sufficiently described in connection with (ii) Shajra. survey. A few observations only need be added here.

1642. Financial Commissioner's Book Circular No. 7 of 1865 required that in villages, different parts of which belonged to different maháls, the "fields possessed by disconnected proprietors or communities should be marked with a different colour for each." So far as possible this was done, but where the subdivision of villages was very great it had to be neglected.

1643. In the shajra are often shown with the same marks as wells still in use many which had ceased to be used and even fallen in before survey. It would apparently be

better, when shajras are again prepared, that some separate mark should be put upon the latter (such as a black line drawn across them); and indeed that wells used for irrigation should be distinguished from all others, not only those that have fallen into disuse, but those also which are exclusively used for drinking purposes. And it would also be better, with a view to its being specially checked by the inspecting officer, that "recent fallow." (see para. 162) should be immediately apparent on the face of the shajra.

1644. The Panjab shajra has this peculiarity only, that it has enfaced upon it an agreement by the proprietors about manure, waqf, and nazúl.

1645. As a general rule there is a single Khasra for each village; but in the cases referred to in para. 1642 it was laid down that (4) Khasra. "distinct khasras, or rather distinct extracts from one general khasra, to be kept with the record of each separate mahál," should be made. This was done in four parganas, Aldeman, Majhaura, Amsin, and Tanda. but elsewhere the additional extracts were dispensed with. They were the less wanted that the lands belonging to each mahál are separately detailed not only in the khationi, but also the serial number of the khasra being followed in the "misl taqsim."

1646. The Panjáb khasra has attached to it an agreement on the part of the proprietors about bághs and trees at the time in existence, those that might thereafter be planted or grown, spontaneously, the rights of the proprietors respecting tenants' bághs, the right of cultivators to land for cane-press and threshing-floors, the right of tenants to fire-wood, and customs relating to grazing lands.

1647. In the mauzas of Fyzabad and Ajudhya, the column for the name, parentage, and caste of owners is left blank, this being the result of a special reference to the Commissioner. There were various reasons for the omission, among them being these, that the mauzas were excluded from assessment, and that the Settlement Courts had nothing to do with the determination of the ownership of the land, suits relating to it not being cognizable by those Courts.

1648. Regarding the Shajra abádi, Khasra abádi, and I Fard cháhát-o-taláb, all that need be noted is that, according to the Pan-jáb system, the first contains some particulars regarding the abádi, and the last some agreements about irrigation, the repairs of existing wells, and the sinking of new ones.

(5) Shajra abádi.

(6) Khasra abádi.

(7) Fard cháhát.

1649: The No. II. statements, though separately prepared for each village, are bound up together in pargana volumes (see para. 1707).

No. II. Statements.

1650. In Circular No. 23 of 1864, the jamabandi is spoken of as distinct from the Schedule of rent arrangements required by Circular No. I. of 1863, where no such distinction is drawn. The object of the jamabandi is in the later circular said to be to "give the Settlement Officer some idea of the alleged rent-roll at the time the assessment is being made," and it has been seen above that a "rent-roll jama," based upon pre-assessment jamabandis, was one of the checks employed in the assessment. But these jamabandis were not included in the kishtwar misl; they do not appear (para. 1133) to have been even retained in the Settlement office.

Jamabandi.

1651. Attached to the report above mentioned on the adaptation of Mr. Prinsep's system to Oudh is a supplementary one on the jamabandi, and in it occur some remarks concerning that paper which presumably explain its elimination from the record. These are: (1) the paper is one which in its very nature is liable to contain much that is inaccurate and unreliable, and experience has proved the rottenness of those assessments which are *mainly* based on the rent-roll obtained from a jamabandi; (2) a circular of the Sadr Board of Revenue, North-Western Provinces, lays down that "barring.....exceptional cases, the Board do not think that the preparation of the jamabandi, as a preliminary record of settlement, should be recommended to the Settlement Officer; (3) the settlement record is prepared with reference to *subsequent* utility, for which the schedule of rent arrangements was considered to supersede the jamabandi.

1652. Khationi No. I., as usually prepared, I believe follows the khasra. In this district, however, such is not always the case. The details of cultivated and uncultivated land are not taken from that paper, but from the "corrected jamabandis" (para. 1107), and thus the details of the khationi and khasra are not always in harmony with each other. A further peculiarity of the khationi in this district is that it sometimes contains a "hissa-kashi," or detail of shares; but, so far as it is affected by the khewat, it will be again referred to in connection with that paper.

(8) Khationi No. I. In the preparation of Khationi No. II. the ordinary course was followed. It was made a register only of decreed lands.

(9) Khationi No. II. 1653. The Misl Taksim is confined to subdivided villages belonging in whole or part to complex maháls. Its main purpose was the complete separation of the lands belonging to the different maháls, by the partition of those previously held in common by two or more of them; but, even as regards the lands previously held in severalty, a great difficulty had to be encountered in the fact that the "records of these holdings, as found in the public offices, did not by any manner of means tally with actual possession." Three points had to be looked to and, if possible, reconciled: (1) *ancestral* share, (2) *recorded* share, and (3) *possessed* share.

1654. "At the outset of Settlement operations it was thought that it would be of great advantage if the more-influential land-holders could be induced to arrange exchanges amongst themselves of their small outlying and isolated holdings, so as to reduce their possessions as far as possible to entire villages. Such a measure is strongly advocated in Thomason's despatches. The saving in trouble to the public officials and expense to the proprietors, if it could have been carried out, would have been incalculable. But experience has proved the impossibility of reconciling so many conflicting interests to the introduction of the reform; and those concerned find ready excuses in the difficulty that undoubtedly exists in finding holdings in which the title,

area, and profits are so evenly balanced as to induce an exchange. The measure was therefore reluctantly abandoned. There is perhaps no great reason for regretting this result since the Financial Commissioner has ruled that complete partition must be made of all holdings within villages which belong to different estates, and by this means somewhat similar results are achieved."

1655. The case of complex maháls is governed by Book Circular No. 7 of 1865. Shortly before the issue of that circular Mr. Carnegy had written and submitted two memoranda, in which he described the complex maháls existing in parts of this district, and requesting instructions regarding the distribution of the Government demand over the fractional holdings they contained, and the mode of exhibiting such maháls in the settlement returns. He explained how they had up to that time been treated, which was that the land held in severalty by each mahál had been ascertained, and where ancestral share and possession did not coincide, the former was not reverted to if the bar of limitation existed, except under agreement ; but a new fractional (biswát) share was struck in accordance with the lands it held in severalty, and this was then made the measure of its interest in the common lands and common rights. He pointed out that similar tenures had been found in the older provinces, and that the instructions there in force concerning them were also capable of application here ; but he suggested that the complete partition of lands held in common by the maháls (which those instructions necessitated) should be dispensed with in this district. He gave as reasons for the course proposed the great time and trouble the partition would require (there being 1,181 subdivided mauzas), and the great delay there would be in the introduction of the Government demand, while he contended that the distribution of that demand on the common lands might very well follow the shares fixed as above.

1656. The Financial Commissioner, while recognizing Mr. Carnegy's "perfect acquaintance with the structure of these tenures," considered the necessity of having the work done by experienced agency, while still available, was "in proportion to its intricacy and difficulty"; and though he conceded that, in order to avoid unnecessary delay in introducing

revised jamas, the partition need not be made before their introduction, after much reflection he arrived at the conclusion that it was advisable to "adopt the course prescribed by lengthened experience and excellent authority," and insist on the partition. It was stated that the issue of the circular had been for some time and was still contemplated, and it was directed that it should be acted up to. This was accordingly done.

1657. In carrying out the provisions of the circular the original procedure was as follows. In its fullest form (confined nearly to the Majhaura and Surhampur parganas), after the decision of claims to proprietary right had been completed in a village, agreements about the adjustment of shares were taken from the decree-holders and filed in the judicial volume. Generally, however, the first steps relating to the partition were only taken when it was on the point of being made. A written agreement, sometimes a twofold one, was then demanded from the parties concerned, expressing their acquiescence in the partition, after which a goshwára or abstract was drawn up in the annexed form, showing what each mahál had previously held in severalty, what it should receive, and the amount of common land awarded to it ; and detailed lists were then drawn up, showing the plots finally comprised in the share of each mahál as the result of the partition. The proceedings, being thus complete, were sent with a report by the Sadr Munsarim or Munsarim to the Extra Assistant Commissioner entrusted with the supervision of the record-work, and, if considered satisfactory, were formally approved by him.

1658. "Our enquiries," says Mr. Carnegie, "soon led to the conclusion that the proprietary communities as a rule were desirous that the holdings to be recorded at this settlement should be shown in accordance with long existing possession rather than according to ancestral share....They were encouraged to carry this out to the utmost extent amongst themselves without resort to Government officials. This has resulted in this portion of the work being disposed of in a satisfactory manner without extraneous intervention and with comparatively little trouble to this Department. The people have adjusted their respective holdings amongst





themselves according to long existing possession, and an agreement signed by those concerned has been given in, verified, and filed in every village which has holdings in two or more distinct mahals."

1659. It appears also that in these "intermixed maháls ...much benefit has been derived by getting influential and disinterested members of the class concerned to assist...as jurors and arbitrators. These men were associated with the Sadr Munsarim, and after arranging disputes to the best of their power, the cases were made over for final disposal to the Extra Assistant Commissioner."

1660. The procedure described in the last three paras. was followed throughout the district, except in parts of Isauli and Sultánpur where no record was made of intermediate steps, and it was left to the khationi, signed and verified by the persons concerned, to show the land ultimately assigned to each mahál.

1661. If there was ever any doubt as to the advisability of the partition of common lands, it may be regarded as set at rest by what has been said in para. 1656 ; but there is another inconvenience connected with it, other than those mentioned by Mr. Carnegie, which does not appear to have been foreseen or provided for.

1662. So far as the partition depends upon agreement, it is of course essential that the acquiescence of each sharer should be beyond dispute. Unfortunately, however, it seems to have been taken for granted that this would be obtained as a matter of course, and the assumption was not altogether realized. Many villages, as stated by Mr. Carnegie, are broken up between from two to ten maháls, and in Khanda this number is considerably exceeded, while within each of these maháls again there are generally several sharers. It will therefore be manifest that it is frequently very difficult even to get hold of all the sharers, and it is needless to say it is still more so to obtain their consent. The record of that consent, moreover, had in great measure to be left to subordinate native agency, and it is not surprising, therefore, that agreements do not in all cases bear upon them as satisfactory an assurance as could be wished of the participation in them of all the persons concerned. A single omission,

however, may suffice to render the whole partition invalid, and cases have come into Court which have given reason for regret that it was not authoritatively decided at the outset, whether each individual sharer's separate consent was necessary, and whether, on the failure of any sharer to attend when summoned, the record department had power to proceed with the partition, and, as in a judicial suit, make the result binding on the defaulter.

1663. In connection with this subject of partition, it is important to note, as perhaps sufficient to reconcile apparently great discrepancies of various kinds, that the "biswat," by which the shares of maháls are described, do not always refer to the same unit; even in the same village the same share is at different times differently denoted. The unit is sometimes the entire hadbast mauza; but where two or more villages are demarcated together, each of them, irrespective of their relative size, may be constituted the unit, and assumed to contain twenty biswas. The contrary process again is not uncommon, especially where two villages only are included in the same boundaries; the entire hadbast mauza is retained as the unit, but each of the component parts, whatever its size, is assumed to be ten biswas, and the shares in each are then calculated by the ratio they bear to that fraction. Instances again are to be found of a mode of reckoning not unknown under native rule, with this difference however, that it has now been followed only where villages are demarcated together; each of these villages being made to contain twenty biswas, they together yield forty, or some other multiple of twenty, and the biswas are then calculated with reference to the total, whatever it may be.

1664. The shares of maháls having been defined, it remained to apportion the Government demand between them. As to the way this was done, Mr. Carnegie states that "the new jamas were given out village by village," and "this procedure approves itself to the judgment for various reasons." These I give in as condensed a form as possible.

(1) The distribution of demand according to estates is much facilitated, as the owners of different maháls at once set themselves to estimate how it will fall on their respective holdings, and this mutual distribution obviated much litigation and ill-feeling.

(2) The majority of proprietors are unintelligent, and would probably have often raised objections on suddenly hearing the aggregate increase in the mahálwar jama, though they would have found it impossible to object to the assessment of the component holdings.

(3) Full latitude is given for compliance with para. 63 of the Directions to Settlement Officers.

1665. Taking these in inverted order, the applicability of para. 63 of the Directions—a caution against attaching too much weight to the ready acceptance of a jama—is not immediately perceptible ; but what I think is meant is that by the time the malguzar has to sign his revenue engagement, he has had ample time to reflect upon what he is going to sign. The value of the opportunity, however, depends very much on the soundness of the first and second “ reasons.”

1666. The second of these again is partly dependent on the first ; but besides that its force is weakened by more than one consideration. A mahál in the first place being the regular assessment unit, consistency would seem to require that the demand should be determined and announced according to maháls. Again, it is unquestionably desirable to prevent objections founded only on misapprehension ; but there would appear to be a possibility of doubt whether the precaution adopted is appropriate, or, as the enhancement which suggests it is precisely the same on the total number of mauzas as on the total number of maháls, is even likely to be efficacious. Even at the risk of having to meet some few objections (which, if groundless, would be easily disposed of probably), it is apparently better to let the malguzar know at once and in the plainest terms the exact amount he is to be called upon to pay ; and if an objection is to be confuted by simple examination of the distribution of the entire demand over component holdings, the fact only furnishes a strong argument in favour of declaring simultaneously both the aggregate jama of the mahál and its distribution over the component mauzawar portions. The Dostpur report would appear to speak of the latter as identical with the mauzawar assessments, but this point is more or less closely bound up with the first “ reason.”

1667. With regard to that "reason," while fully recognizing the force of the arguments in favour of leaving the distribution of jama as much as possible to those who have to pay it, in the case of single maháls, where joint liability and joint interest have always existed, I am very much inclined to doubt whether the owners of different maháls, with no common liability or interest, are by any means the best qualified to make such an apportionment of a demand assessed on all their properties collectively as would bring into action in each mahál the various principles on which its assessment should be made.

1668. In practice, whether in observance of the principle of "mutual distribution" or of its neglect, it will generally be found that the old rule has been followed of distributing the jama according to (obsolete) hereditary shares without regard to possession, or that the jama of each mahál share in a mauza bears to the jama of the entire mauza the same ratio as the quantity of land in the share bears to the area of the entire mauza, or, in other words, the jama is distributed according to present "biswat."

1669. The first of these may very possibly be correct. The original partition appears to have been made with jealous care, being often not only khetbat in a general sense, but extending also to the division of individual fields into long thin strips to ensure equality of soil. But from one cause or another the shares thus formed have seldom been maintained intact, and whenever any alteration has taken place in them, adherence to their original and now merely nominal proportion is apt to lead to more or less unsuitable results.

1670. With reference to the distribution of the revenue demand according to present biswat, it should apparently be even and correct enough. There is this difficulty, however, and allusion was made to it in the correspondence referred to in para. 1655, that the quality of the lands in the different shares may not always be in proportion to their quantity. Mr. Carnegie, however, represented that to proceed upon the former would amount to "a general zila butwara," and that it was also unnecessary "for there is a

great sameness about the natural soils of any village," and though the Commissioner and Financial Commissioner concurred that, where it was demanded, an apportionment of the revenue demand should be made according to the quality of the land, still they conceded that ordinarily the course proposed by Mr. Carnegie, of not going beyond its quantity, would be sufficient.

1671. Generally speaking, then, no exception can be taken to biswat distribution ; but there are two classes of cases at least to which the above arguments are not applicable, and the distribution of the revenue demand is in consequence at fault. In the first place, even where the biswat is struck on cultivation alone, the shares of different maháls may be in separate blocks, and thus equality of area may be attended with great inequality of value. And, in the second place, the biswat has not always been struck on cultivation alone, but on total areas, waste included ; and as the greater part of the waste may very possibly lie in one mahál, a biswat distribution may, like the one described in para. 1245, throw on that mahal much more than its fair share of the Government demand.

1672. There is one other flaw also, which must not be overlooked, in purely proportional distribution, whichever of the above methods may be chosen ; while we are not assessing land merely, but men (para. 1278), the animate element is no less liable to meet with inequality of treatment than the inanimate.

1673. The Khewats prepared in this district are of several different kinds. There are, first, (11.) Khewat. the old system khewats for ordinary maháls ; then the "complex mahál" khewat, prescribed by Circular 7 of 1865 ; and, lastly, there is the "shajra nasab mai khewat" of the Panjáb system.

1674. The first set call for no remark, unless it is that apparently, either owing to a desire on the part of the record office to obtain extreme accuracy, or the extreme sub-division of shares, the biswat, representatives of those shares, are given not only in biswas and biswansis or annas and pies as

the case may be, but are further worked out to fractions with denominators of as many as ten figures. It is perhaps a question whether some slight sacrifice of exactitude might not have been made with the result of at least a proportionate increase in utility.

1675. Of the khewat prescribed by Circular 7 of 1865, as, though not uncommon in this district, comparatively little known elsewhere, I give a specimen in the appendix. It is sufficiently explicit in itself; indeed, it brings together heads of information which, with special reference to the size of the settlement records, might perhaps be advantageously separated. It is evident that the entries in the first columns must be briefer than the last, and thus what the former have to say is often exhausted in the first page, and they remain blank for pages afterwards, while the scores of names of pattidars which have to be entered in column 23, and are sometimes the only entry in an opening, are compressed into a narrow space about half-an-inch or less in width. It would apparently be a better plan, though perhaps not the best possible, to give the first five columns in a page by themselves at the beginning of the khewat, columns 6 to 11 at the beginning of each thoke, and perhaps even columns 12 to 17 at the beginning of each patti, the whole of an opening being thus left to columns 18 to 26.

1676. Of the "shajra nasab mai khewat," as adapted to this district, a specimen is also given in the appendix. It is well enough suited for simple maháls. For complex maháls it was not originally designed however, and all that was done to effect its adaptation to them was the insertion of a single column. This does not appear to me to have sufficiently answered its intended purpose, and it may be worth consideration at the next settlement, whether, even if the shajra nasab be retained, a separate khewat should not be prepared also. Where a mahál consists of two or three mauzas or parts of mauzas, with two or three sharers in each, the shajra nasab contains all the information that should be found in the khewat. But in maháls of a more complicated character, where there are many mauzas or many sharers, or both, a list of villages, with the amount of the mahál's share in them, and perhaps the number of sharers

only, is given, and the detail of shares and sharers is left to the khationi and the fard radifwar malikan (or alphabetical list of proprietors). In zemindari maháls the list of shares is entered in the body of the khationi, which, indeed, in such cases contains nothing else; while in pattidari maháls it is relegated to the column of remarks in that paper, which thus becomes the substitute for the greater and more intricate part of the elaborate khewat of Circular 7 of 1865. If such a khewat is necessary according to one system, it can hardly be less so according to the other.

1677. In the Panjáb khewats are given, in addition to its own more proper entries, the origin of the name of the village and of the zemindari right, customs relating to division of the area, and receipts from common lands, and also those relating to partition, inheritance, and transfer.

1678. The broad principle observed in the preparation of the khewat was the record of actual possession. There were, however, some exceptions, and they occurred chiefly in the following cases :—

(a) Where previously existing possession was altered by decrees ; (b) where complex maháls existed ; (c) where equalization of shares took place.

1679. Where decrees necessitated changes, they also defined their nature and extent. The changes caused by the existence of complex maháls have just been described.

1680. As to equalization of shares, it was pointed out in Circular 22 of 1864 that “in coparcenary estates it frequently happens that some of the coparceners actually hold in severalty an amount of land which is more or less (as the case may be) than that to which they would be entitled were the entire lands of the estate apportioned according to ancestral shares.” It was then laid down that “whenever the coparcenary community express a desire to have their ancestral shares recorded in fractions of a rupee or bigah, the request should be complied with;” but it was to be understood that “no change of possession can be enforced in regard to lands held in severalty when they have been so held by their present occupants for a period exceeding the term of limitation.”



1681. In Circular No. 9 of 1866 however, though the infringement of the law of limitation by the Settlement Courts was admitted to be impossible, it was directed that as there was a strong feeling that holdings should be brought into accord with acknowledged shares, "full opportunity should be given to the brotherhood at the time of preparing the khewat to effect by mutual agreement or voluntary arbitration any redistribution of the holdings which they may determine upon."

1682. From a memorandum of Mr. Carnegy of the 13th January, 1865, it appears that in cases that had up to that time come to light of shares and possession being at variance within the same mahál, the same plan had been followed as when the shares belonged to different maháls—that is, where the variation was nominal, the ancestral shares had been maintained or reverted to; where it was marked, the fraction representing the share was corrected, possession remaining unaltered.

1683. Subsequently, however, other modes of adjustment were employed. Where there was no wide departure from the ancestral shares, a transfer of cultivated land was sometimes made, by which inequality was removed. In other cases again, where there was an appreciable deficiency in the ancestral shares, it was made up out of the waste land.

1684. Changes of these kinds are shown in the records drawn up on the Panjáb plan in a "fard kámobeshi," which shows the amount of land originally belonging to each patti, the amount it lost or gained, and the amount ultimately comprised in it. In the records prepared on the older method, the only indication of the transfer is the inclusion of the fields affected in their new pattis in the khationi.

1685. These changes, like those referred to in the misl taqsim, are conditional on the consent of all the parties concerned, and here, as there, that consent is not always clearly expressed. Similar difficulties have consequently arisen, and the recorded changes have now and then been contested or remained inoperative. This, however, is the case only in pattidari maháls; in others, even where possible, no equalization of shares was attempted.

1686. With respect to the distribution of the revenue demand, Circular No. 22 of 1864 directed that, where shares and possession did not agree, the demand was to be apportioned according to the amount and quality of land. In Circular No. 9 of 1866 the general principle was reiterated that "the assessment should be in accord with the extent and quality of land and the means of cultivation;" but, though officers superintending the preparation of khewats were instructed that the distribution of the assessment must be such as to secure its regular realization, they were also told that "ordinarily such a distribution would be best effected by leaving it in the first instance to the people themselves." Popular feeling, it was further said, was in favour of the maintenance of shares; claims to equalization of assessments with holdings were not to be considered to have necessarily a fair foundation, and discrimination in dealing with them was enjoined.

1687. In practice, the jama was distributed on ancestral shares in zemindari, and on possession in bhayachāra, mahāls. Where the pattidari tenure prevailed, as has been seen to be the case with land, so also in the original distribution of jama there was, I think, rather too strong a tendency to be guided by ancestral shares, even where they were previously unequal, and no equalization professed to have been made. In such cases the difficulties mentioned in para. 1669 were repeated, and though they were on a smaller scale, they were of the greater importance, as they more immediately affected individuals.

1688. While occasional inequality in the incidence of the revenue demand, however, is thus pointed out, its existence must not be taken for granted without a careful examination of the entire khewat. The incidence may at first sight seem very heavy, whereas, on further examination, it may turn out to be perfectly fair. This is owing to the way the demand is entered in the khewat, which is, that the entire amount due upon each share is shown against the land held in severalty, without any allusion to lands held in common with other shares, against which, whatever its amount, nothing at all is shown.

1689. It appears to have been for a short time doubtful whether engagements for the revenue should be taken for each mahál or each village. The former appears to have been recommended by Mr. Carnegy, and though in the Dostpur report he states that a memorandum of his of the 8th July, 1865, on this subject, had not been fully answered, and that he had proceeded on a general approval of his views intimated in a letter of the same month, I find that in earlier correspondence of the same year the Financial Commissioner wrote that he had "no doubt as to the necessity and expediency of taking revenue engagements and defining responsibilities in such cases"—complex maháls—"mahálwar not mauzawar."

1690. Whatever the authority for it, kabuliats have in all cases been taken for maháls, not for mauzas.

1691. The correspondence of July, 1865, though it touched upon the question of mauzawar and mahálwar kabuliats, did so only with reference to another district; it had a narrower scope, and referred mainly to those cases above mentioned (para. 200), in which maháls consist of part of a single village only. In such cases, and indeed wherever a mahál was very small,—a revenue limit of Rs. 200 being fixed,—Mr. Carnegy proposed that it should be attached to some other larger mahál, according to the choice of the proprietor. To this proposal the Financial Commissioner yielded an apparently doubtful approval.

1692. Maháls paying a revenue of less than Rs. 200, therefore, were included in the kabuliat of some larger one, a proceeding which does not seem to have been occasionally without its disadvantage to the smaller proprietors, to judge from a petition that recently came under my notice, in which one of them complained that he was threatened with various penalties on account of the default of the lumberdar of the larger mahál, and applied for a separate engagement for his own village. The multiplication of maháls is perhaps an evil, but it may be doubted whether the remedy lies in the multiplication of the hands through which the revenue has to pass.

1693. In all villages subject to fluvial action the usual conditions regarding revision of assessment are entered in the

kabuliat, which, where the Panjáb form of it is used, contains also agreements about village expenses, appointment of lumberdars, pay of patwári and chaukidar, and various other matters, *amurat ám o qánúní*.

1694. The Schedule of rent arrangements is defined in Circular 1 of 1863 to be "a record of (3) Tassia Lagan, or schedule of rent arrangements. the rent-roll as adjusted between landlord and tenant after the determination of the revised demand." It was to be filed by every landlord for the fasli year succeeding the declaration of that demand, and was to be supported, as far as it concerned tenants-at-will, by kabusliats taken from them.

1695. "Any little trouble," says Mr. Carnegy, "that officers may take to bring about a proper understanding at that time will in the end be found to have been labour well bestowed;" and the procedure followed in this district, which is said to have been matured in communication with the Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner, is thus described:—

1696. "Proprietors were directed to send lists to the Sadr Munsarim of those tenants who had failed to come to terms. The parties were then sent for, and as a rule they were induced through the representations of assessors to settle their difference. When this course fails, each case is taken up by the Sadr Munsarim as a suit for adjustment of rent, is prepared in the usual manner, and is then sent up to the assistant or myself; but such cases, I may say, are quite exceptional."

1697. In a report written a few months after that first quoted, again, Mr. Carnegy further stated that "experience had confirmed his belief that . . . official intervention was not only necessary but *absolutely essential* to the successful starting of a new settlement. So utterly listless are the zemindars in regard to their own interests that, as a rule, they let the proper season pass without issuing the necessary notice of enhancements; and whenever this is the case and a dispute arises, the Rent Court has no alternative but to maintain the former payment of the tenant, while the landlord has to pay the new assessment, which ordinarily in this district means 50 per cent. more than he formerly paid.

The result, of course, is that the new arrangements are badly inaugurated, and mischief is done by the proprietor being thrown into difficulties, and the Settlement Officer bears the blame which belongs by rights to the proprietors alone.

1698. In 1868, again, Mr. Carnegy pointed out that the Rent Act had effected a change in the law regarding adjustment of rents. The redress open to the proprietor was to issue a notice of ejectment, and this at the settlement, when rents have to be speedily arranged, really "amounts to no redress at all. The tenants can all combine, and in such an emergency they cannot all be ousted without ruining the village and endangering the Government revenue. Under such circumstances it is fortunate that the landowners and the tenants of this district have alike found it to their advantage to continue the practice of having their rents adjusted and leases regularly exchanged, as before, through the intervention of this department, and so the procedure of Circular 1 of 1863 is still generally followed on the application of the parties on disputes arising, even though that procedure be somewhat different from the new law."

1699. Such was the procedure contemplated by Mr. Carnegy. Unfortunately, however, it had in great measure to be left to subordinate ministerial establishments to carry out, and though they do not seem to have been responsible for what occurred in Amsin and Akbarpur, it is to be feared their work was often perfunctorily and inaccurately done. It lay with them to decide (for the purpose of the schedules) what constituted sufficient acquiescence in the enhancement of rent on the part of those who had to pay it, and they appear to have been very easily satisfied.

1700. Some years ago the question was raised whether these schedules should not be altogether omitted from the settlement records. Ultimately however, after some correspondence between the Commissioners of this division and that of Rae Bareli, it was decided that for particular reasons they might be dispensed with in three parganas, Sultānpur, Isauli, and Khandansa, but that elsewhere, in deference to Mr. Carnegy's strongly expressed opinion, they should be completed and included in the records.

1701. The Wajib-ul-arz in the Panjáb record is only conspicuous by its absence ; its *disjecta membra* lie scattered over various other papers which have been already mentioned.

1702. Where the wajib-ul-arz has been retained, one has, in accordance with Circular 20 of 1863, been made to suffice for an entire mahál, with the exception of those villages in which there are under-proprietary rights. There has, indeed, been one deviation from this course, in respect of the cases mentioned in para. 1627, the wajib-ul-arz being one of the papers separately prepared for each portion of a taluka scattered over two or more parganas.

1703. The various clauses of the wajib-ul-arz do not require separate notice. It need only be pointed out, with respect to those that affect cultivators (the sixth, for instance, which records customs relating to groves), that while in some districts cultivators have been allowed a voice in their formation, here they are purely the accounts given by the proprietors. In the Panjáb system, indeed, the substitutes for the wajib-ul-arz do not profess to be anything else than "ikrar malikán."

1704. The Rubakar akhír, or final proceeding, the last in both systems of record of the mauzawar series of papers, requires no comment.

1705. The total number of mauzawar papers prepared was 123,805.

1706. The Pargana records are—(1) the No. II. statements, (2) the Revision files, (3) the "General statements," and (4), peculiar to the Panjáb system, the "Misl Riawáj-i-am."

1707. A specimen of the No. II. statements is given in the appendix, and an explanation of them is to be found in paras. 1082 to 1130. They have been separately prepared for each village, but have been bound up, as more serviceable in that form, in pargana volumes, in which they are so placed that the two

pages relating to the same village are brought together in the same opening. Many of these were completed before 1869, but they were all soon after re-arranged to bring them into accordance with the changes that took place in that year. To most of them a preface is attached, giving particulars of those changes, and also explaining the system of assessment. In connection with the recent revision, all that was done, as a rule, in the body of these books was to alter the figures of the Government demand, a note being recorded at the beginning of each, specifying the date of the Government orders sanctioning the revisions for the entire pargana, and stating that each revision was the subject of a separate file.

1708. The Revision files still remained unbound when the district ceased to be under settlement. Those of one pargana had some time before been arranged for binding, but it was found more convenient to keep them separate until the correction of the settlement records was completed. They will, however, ultimately be bound up in pargana volumes.

(2.) Revision files.

1709. Respecting the General Statement, all that need be said is that, in accordance with the provincial rule, it has been prepared mahálwar, details being given under each mahál for the various villages and parts of villages comprised in it.

(3.) General statement.

1710. The Misl Riwáj-i-ám contains, as its name denotes, a record of general customs. It is divided into four parts: (1) customs regarding inheritance and succession; (2) customs regarding accretion in riverine villages; (3) irrigation from rain-streams, jhils common to two or more villages, &c.; (4) remuneration of village servants.

(4.) Misl Riwáj-i-ám.

#### *Section V.—Miscellaneous.*

1711. Annexed is a list of the officers who took part in the settlement of the district.

Officers.

## NAME OF OFFICER.

*Settlement Officers.*

1. Mr. P. Carnegy, C.I.E.
2. Captain (now Colonel) E.G. Clark, Officiating.
3. Captain (now Major) G. E. Erskine, Officiating.
4. Mr. J. Woodburn, C.S., Officiating.
5. Mr. M. L. Ferrar, C.S., Officiating.
6. Mr. H. H. Butts, Officiating.
7. Mr. A. F. Millett, C.S., Officiating.

*Extra Assistant Committsioners.*

1. Munshi Najaf Ali.
2. Mr. K. Nicholson.
3. Munshi Wazir Husen Khan.
4. Munshi Shioprashad.
5. Munshi Ali Husen Khan.
6. Munshi Mahomed Hasan.
7. Munshi Harsukh Rai.
8. Munshi Ináyat-ul-lah.
9. Munshi Harprashad.

## NAME OF OFFICER.

*Assistant Settlement Officers.*

1. Captain (now Colonel) Ouseley.
2. Captain (now Colonel) E. G. Clark.
3. Captain (now Major) G. E. Erskine.
4. Mr. J. Woodburn, C.S.
5. Mr. (now Major) C. S. Noble.
6. Mr. MacMahon.
7. Mr. W. C. Benett, C.S.
8. Mr. C. Chapman.
9. Mr. A. F. Millett, C.S.
10. Mr. C. J. Connell, C.S.
11. Mr. J. Deas, C.S.

*Sadr Munsarims.*

1. Munshi Maslahuddin.
2. Pandit Dayashankar.
3. Munshi Mohan Lal.
4. Munshi Hasan Ali.
5. Munshi Chironji Lal.
6. Munshi Shioprashad.
7. Bábu Judishthir Singh.
8. Munshi Mahadeoprashad.
9. Munshi Dhanpat Rai.
10. Munshi Gayaprashad.

1712. Of the Settlement Officers, Mr. Carnegy, who, after leaving the settlement became Commissioner of the Rae Bareli Division, retired last year on pension ; the rest still hold various appointments under the Government of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh.

1713. Of subordinate officers, four only served in the Settlement Department during the time I was in charge of it, *viz.*, Messrs. Connell and Deas, Assistant Settlement Officers, M. Shioprashad, Extra Assistant Commissioner, and Bábu Judishthir Singh, Sadr Munsarim.

1714. Mr. Connell is a very able and energetic officer and an unusually quick worker, while his services were the more valuable in the Settlement Department, as before entering it he had already taken a deep interest in questions of



land-revenue and tenures, and made them a special study. Mr Deas also possesses great ability, and is very careful and painstaking. To both of these officers, as I have already acknowledged in pargana reports, I am greatly indebted for their very earnest co-operation in the disposal of the numerous and difficult petitions against over-assessment.

1715. Munshi Shioprashad served in the department, with the exception of the first two years, during the whole of the time it existed, and this was but a comparatively small portion of a long period passed in the service of Government, throughout which he has maintained a high reputation for zeal and integrity. Bábu Judishthir Singh came to this district from Bahraich, where he had already gained the commendation of the Settlement Officer for the care and ability with which he supervised the preparation of the records and of the satisfactory manner in which he performed that duty in this district. It is sufficient to say that he was appointed to a tahsildarship in 1875, but that, with a view to his being retained in superintendence of record-work, he continued to be employed as Sadr Munsarim until the end of the settlement.

1716. The Demarcation of boundaries commenced in 1860 and terminated in 1861. Settlement operations commenced in October, 1862, and continued until the 31st October, 1878, when it was formally notified that the district ceased to be under settlement from that date.

1717. The total cost of the settlement was Rs. 8,77,167. This is not only, taken by itself, a very large sum, but it is also considerably more than the settlement has cost in any other district: so that if the figures had to be left to speak for themselves, they could hardly appear satisfactory.

Cost. Expenditure large.

1718. If, however, the expenditure they represent requires justification, there are several things which more or less help to furnish it, some of which have been already alluded to as

But not out of proportion to work done.

explaining the quantity or difficulty of various branches of work. First, there is the size of the district; and next, there is the number of villages it is divided into—a material fact, as it has a direct influence upon the amount of work to be done. Then there is further the great sub-division of villages, and yet again the smallness of fields, while, adding still other complications, are the character of tenures and the great number of sharers in many maháls and sub-settlements.

1719. Nor must it be forgotten that some kinds of papers have been prepared in this district which are not found in others, such as the statements mentioned in para. 1595, and the misl taqsim, or that work of a special character has had to be performed in this district which does not ordinarily devolve upon the Settlement Department, such as the separate demarcation of nearly 300 villages, and taking up lands for railway purposes in many others. The revision of assessment must probably be considered part and parcel of the settlement, but allowance should nevertheless be made for other work, such as the hearing of suits carried on during its progress, but entirely unconnected with it.

1720. Lastly, in estimating the cost of the settlement, not only expenditure must be taken into account, but receipts also, which in the shape of court-fees, amounted to some thousands of rupees.

1721. It is, however, doubtful how far any justification of the expenditure is required at all. It falls under three main heads: (1) measurement, (2) records, and (3) general and judicial. The measurement was completed many years ago at a lower rate than the provincial average (para. 941). Regarding expenditure on records, a general enquiry was made in 1870, not only past expenditure being criticised, but a rough estimate being also formed of what would subsequently be required. The total thus obtained for this district was considered moderate, and the amount actually expended was somewhat lower, the former having been [Rs. 2,92,509, the latter Rs. 2,66,527. There remains only the third head, which, consisting principally of the salary of office and of fixed

And already pronounced moderate.

establishment, in each case dependent on the previous sanction of Government, it is beyond my province to discuss.

1722. The cost of the settlement, as shown in the second statement in the appendix, is about 53 per cent. of the revised demand for one year. The increase of that demand upon the one it superseded was Rs. 4,02,508, so that the cost of the settlement, Rs. 8,77,168, heavy as it may seem, was covered by the increase in a little more than two years.

1723. This completes my account of the settlement of the district. Though it may be long, it is not more so, I think, than is consistent with the proper explanation of the numerous subjects that have had to be considered. In some instances indeed, instead of confining myself to a simple description of the procedure followed, I have pointed out what appear to me to be defects in it ; but I trust it will be obvious that this is the result, not of any unnecessary criticism on my part, but of the necessity under which I lay, of showing as clearly as possible everything that interfered with the working of the assessment (and this will be found to include with all the defects adverted to) in connection with the revision of assessment in which I was principally engaged during the time that I was in charge of the settlement.

Conclusion.

A. F. MILLETT,

*Officiating Settlement Officer.*

---

## APPENDIX.

---

No. 1.—Comparative statement of revenue and field survey.

Name of tahsil.		Name of pargana.		AREA IN ACRES BY THE												Remarks.							
				Number of mauzas.				Revenue survey.				Field survey.											
				Original de- marcation.		Settlement		Cultivated.		Culturable.		Barren.		Total.			Cultivated.		Culturable.		Barren.		Total.
				3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13									
<b>Fyzabad District.</b>																							
Fyzabad	...	...	184	185	52,693	10,607	12,365	75,068	46,401	11,973	22,824	81,198											
"	...	...	113	114	51,765	6,752	9,897	68,384	46,492	8,001	10,988	74,481											
"	...	...	180	193	42,691	9,399	6,223	58,313	40,137	9,006	14,008	63,151											
			478	492	1,47,149	26,758	28,158	2,02,368	1,33,030	28,980	56,820	2,18,830											
			Total																				
Bikapur	...	...	502	503	1,44,545	51,465	24,495	2,20,508	1,26,315	44,285	53,044	2,23,644											
"	...	...	123	128	48,538	15,064	9,613	73,215	41,995	14,436	18,388	74,819											
			630	631	1,93,083	66,530	34,108	2,93,721	1,68,310	58,721	71,432	2,98,463											
			Total																				
Aktarpur	...	...	372	399	92,942	47,856	27,532	1,68,330	82,980	25,109	60,099	1,68,188											
"	...	...	245	266	52,361	20,092	10,389	82,842	48,400	13,556	20,233	82,589											
			617	665	1,45,303	67,948	37,921	2,51,172	1,31,380	39,065	80,332	2,50,777											
			Total																				
Tanda	...	...	215	279	51,831	12,164	9,671	73,666	47,031	9,609	22,631	79,274											
"	...	...	392	520	84,368	32,535	21,321	1,38,224	78,427	25,546	37,406	1,41,879											
"	...	...	235	238	55,331	27,456	10,622	93,409	50,043	14,334	27,879	92,256											
			842	1,037	1,91,530	72,155	41,614	3,05,299	1,75,501	49,489	87,919	3,12,909											
			Total																				
Total of whole district				2,567	2,825	6,77,065	2,33,391	1,42,101	10,52,557	6,08,221	1,76,955	2,96,503	10,80,979										
<b>Transferred to Sultanpur District.</b>																							
Kadirpur	...	...	475	508	1,10,313	47,737	38,852	1,96,954	99,319	28,250	70,018	1,97,587											
Sultanpur	...	...	460	460	1,06,257	31,219	27,669	1,65,145	93,110	31,353	41,346	1,65,809											
Musafirkhana	...	...	99	99	36,592	10,262	7,947	54,901	30,043	11,487	14,009	55,539											
			1,034	1,067	2,53,164	89,368	74,468	4,17,000	2,22,472	71,090	1,25,373	4,18,935											
			Total																				
GRAND TOTAL				3,601	3,892	9,30,229	3,22,759	2,16,569	1,46,957	830,693	2,47,345	4,21,876	14,99,914										

No. II.—Statement of Cost of settlement.

Name of pargana.	Number of mauzas.	Number of village papers.	Measurement.	Cost of							Grand Total of cols. 4, 5, 9.	Cost per square milc.					Percentage of cost on revised demand.	Remarks.
				General and judicial.					Total.	10		11	12					
				Records.	Officers.	Fixed establishment.	Contingencies.											
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13						
Aldeman	602	18,837	16,786	37,128	42,531	11,841	4,117	53,489	1,12,403	Rs. 318 6 9	46 13 3		Note.—Owing to the impossibility of recasting the data relating to measurement and records, the same arrangement of parganas cannot be followed in this statement as in others.					
Sunharpur	235	7,500	6,985	15,464	21,245	5,940	2,059	29,244	51,693	Rs. 349 4 6	55 11 11							
Majhora	182	6,552	3,509	12,076	13,721	3,837	1,330	18,588	34,473	Rs. 465 13 5	64 9 6							
Total	1,019	32,859	27,280	64,669	77,497	21,618	7,506	1,06,621	1,98,569	Rs. 345 5 4	51 6 9							
Bihar	525	20,006	10,591	39,098	50,387	14,039	4,838	69,359	1,19,045	Rs. 531 7 6	79 11 10							
Akbarpur	400	11,799	12,964	20,934	33,169	9,274	3,214	45,657	79,535	Rs. 295 11 11	48 0 1							
Tanda	220	6,537	4,159	8,071	14,430	4,040	1,400	19,890	32,120	Rs. 349 1 11	54 2 7							
Total	1,145	38,354	27,714	68,103	98,006	27,403	9,497	1,34,906	2,30,723	Rs. 394 6 4	58 10 0							
Pachhimurath	503	15,805	8,453	35,315	44,763	12,516	4,338	61,617	1,05,352	Rs. 367 3 1	51 7 3							
Amsin	202	6,432	3,340	9,954	12,256	3,427	1,188	16,871	30,165	Rs. 231 14 9	37 8 11							
Haveli Oudh	185	5,787	4,777	11,255	16,861	4,697	1,628	23,126	39,155	Rs. 308 5 5	41 4 4							
Maugelsi	114	3,739	3,248	8,609	9,807	2,742	950	13,499	25,446	Rs. 201 15 1	24 7 6							
Total	1,004	31,838	19,818	65,223	83,627	25,382	8,104	1,15,113	2,00,154	Rs. 309 5 8	41 5 8							
Sultanpur	497	13,939	8,715	49,736	91,206	25,500	8,393	1,25,538	1,84,936	Rs. 540 14 6	75 13 2							
Khaddassa	126	3,838	3,052	10,524	17,445	4,962	1,719	24,429	38,046	Rs. 352 4 2	50 0 7							
Isauli	99	2,982	1,762	8,273	10,615	2,976	1,032	14,653	24,688	Rs. 233 12 0	36 8 2							
Total	724	20,724	14,565	63,533	1,19,593	33,438	11,589	1,64,620	2,47,722	Rs. 461 4 11	63 14 6							
Grand Total	3,892	1,23,905	69,331	2,06,527	3,78,723	1,05,341	36,696	5,21,260	8,77,166	Rs. 374 3 5	53 1 11							

*No. III.—Census returns showing*

Name of pargana.	Number of mauzas.		Detail of castes and occupation.	Number of houses.		
	Original demarcation.	Settlement.		Masonry.	Mud.	Total.
1	2		3	4	5	6
<i>District Fyzabad.</i>						
Haweli Oudh	...	184 185	...	3,074	25,089	28,163
Mangalsi	...	114 114	...	2	16,130	16,132
Amsin	...	180 193	...	8	9,813	9,821
Pachhimrath	...	622 503	...	...	37,812	37,812
Khandansa	...	128 128	...	...	12,136	12,136
Akbarpur	...	372 399	...	13	23,329	23,342
Majhora	...	245 266	...	3	15,895	15,895
Tanda	...	215 279	...	22	14,203	14,225
Birhar	...	392 620	...	4	18,912	18,916
Surharpur	...	235 238	...	...	13,528	13,528
		2567 2825	...	3,126	1,36,847	1,89,973
<i>Parganas transferred to Sultanpur</i>						
Aldemau	...	475 508	...	15	35,067	35,082
Sultanpur	..	460 460	...	...	26,673	26,673
Isauli	...	99 99	...	8	9,777	9,785
Total	...	1034 1067	...	23	71,517	71,540
GRAND TOTAL	...	3601 3892	...	3,149	2,55,364	2,61,513

*creed, occupation, sex, and population.*

## POPULATION.

## HINDUS.

Agriculturists.					Non-agriculturists.					Total Hindus.
Adults.		Minors.		Total.	Adults.		Minors.		Total.	
Male.	Female.	Boys.	Girls.		Male.	Female.	Boys.	Girls.		
7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
17,181	17,022	10,225	8,359	53,387	22,705	18,606	9,043	7,521	57,875	1,11,262
18,365	18,864	10,126	8,414	55,769	8,472	10,142	5,221	4,433	28,268	84,037
12,556	12,484	7,559	5,990	38,589	4,923	5,657	3,296	2,627	16,503	55,092
50,249	50,839	31,057	25,984	158,129	12,529	14,917	8,499	7,079	43,024	20,153
16,203	16,656	9,291	7,738	49,888	6,021	7,323	3,878	3,248	20,475	70,363
26,082	25,552	16,710	14,127	82,471	11,023	11,935	7,574	6,606	37,138	119,609
15,308	14,942	10,071	7,827	43,148	6,717	7,580	4,801	3,914	23,021	71,169
12,482	12,627	8,120	7,132	40,301	6,785	7,409	4,389	3,783	22,866	62,727
22,727	22,254	15,856	13,105	73,942	9,091	10,159	6,759	5,623	31,642	105,584
17,367	15,749	11,041	9,276	53,433	6,340	6,447	4,187	3,627	20,601	74,034
28,520	27,589	130,056	1,07,952	654,117	94,606	1,00,189	57,647	48,471	300,913	955,030
36,472	34,328	22,875	18,427	112,102	12,682	13,245	8,551	6,927	41,405	153,507
31,750	32,269	19,189	15,263	98,451	13,864	15,436	9,060	7,598	45,958	144,409
9,178	9,678	5,426	4,404	28,686	6,292	7,474	4,080	3,411	21,227	49,913
77,400	76,275	47,470	38,094	239,239	32,836	36,125	21,691	17,936	108,590	347,829
285,920	2,83,864	177,526	1,46,046	893,356	127,444	1,36,314	79,388	66,407	409,503	1,302,859



## No. III.—Census returns showing creed,

Name of pargana.	Number of mauzas.		Detail of castes and occupation.	POPUL				
				MUSA				
	Original demar- cation.	Settlement.		Agriculturists.				
				Adults.		Minors.		Total.
Male.	Female.	Boys.	Girls.					
1	2	3	18	19	20	21	22	
<i>District, Fyzabad.</i>								
Haweli Oudh ...	184	185	...	996	1,160	614	477	3,247
Mangalsi ...	114	114	...	1,371	1,679	857	729	4,636
Amsin ...	180	193	...	312	335	196	163	1,006
Pachhimrath ...	502	503	...	1,595	1,890	1,120	877	5,482
Khandansa ...	128	128	...	474	562	391	276	1,703
Akbarpur ...	372	399	...	1,854	2,193	1,341	1,172	6,560
Majhora ...	246	266	...	323	385	227	190	1,125
Tanda ...	215	279	...	1,032	1,259	795	657	3,743
Birhar ...	392	520	...	2,438	2,808	1,743	1,484	8,473
Surharpur ...	235	238	...	899	941	568	519	2,927
	2567	2325	...	11,294	13,212	7,852	6,544	38,902
<i>Parganas transferred to Sultanpur</i>								
Aldemau ...	475	508	...	1,432	1,533	1,070	806	4,841
Sultanpur ...	460	460	...	2,033	2,411	1,347	1,136	6,927
Isauli ...	99	99	...	610	729	389	386	2,114
	1034	1067	...	4,075	4,673	2,806	2,328	13,882
	3601	3892	...	15,369	17,885	10,658	8,872	52,785

## occupation, sex, and population—(continued.)

## LATION.

MUSLIMS.					Total Musalmans.	TOTAL.				
Non-agriculturists.						Agriculturists.				
Adults.		Minors.		Total.		Adults.		Minors.		Total.
Male.	Female.	Boys.	Girls.			Male.	Female.	Boys.	Girls.	
23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33
6,484	5,956	3,056	2,572	18,068	21,315	18,177	18,782	10,839	8,836	56,634
1,218	1,470	817	677	4,182	8,818	10,736	20,547	10,983	9,143	60,405
1,133	1,176	722	632	3,663	4,669	12,868	12,819	7,755	6,153	39,595
1,192	1,477	854	702	4,225	9,707	51,844	52,729	32,177	26,861	163,611
541	562	335	285	1,723	3,426	16,677	17,218	9,682	8,014	51,591
3,318	3,340	2,043	1,285	9,986	16,546	27,936	27,745	18,051	15,299	89,031
623	681	408	346	2,058	3,183	15,631	15,327	10,298	8,017	49,273
3,515	3,774	2,312	2,072	11,673	15,416	18,514	13,886	8,915	7,789	44,104
1,645	2,025	1,154	1,022	5,846	14,319	25,165	25,062	17,599	14,589	82,415
2,185	2,489	1,853	1,937	8,464	11,391	18,266	16,690	11,609	9,795	56,360
21,854	22,950	13,554	11,530	69,888	1,08,790	219,814	2,20,801	137,908	114,496	693,019
1,555	1,602	1,001	859	517	9,858	37,904	35,861	23,945	19,233	116,943
1,308	1,590	820	710	4,428	11,355	33,783	34,680	20,516	16,399	105,378
799	1,267	659	548	3,273	5,387	9,788	10,407	5,815	4,790	30,800
3,662	4,459	2,480	2,117	12,718	26,600	81,475	80,948	50,276	40,422	253,121
25,516	27,400	16,034	13,647	82,606	1,35,390	301,289	3,01,749	188,184	1,54,918	946,140

## No. III.—Census returns showing creed,

Name of pargana.	Number of mauzas.		Detail of castes and occupation.	POPULATION				
	Original demar- cation.	Settlement.		TOTAL.				
				Non-agriculturists.				
				Adults.		Minors		Total.
				Male.	Female.	Boys.	Girls.	
1	2	3	34	35	36	37	38	
<i>District Fyzabad.</i>								
Haweli Oudh ...	184	185	...	29,189	24 562	12,099	10,093	75,943
Mangalsi ...	114	114	...	9,690	11,612	6,038	5,110	32 450
Amsin ...	180	193	...	6,056	6 833	4,018	3,259	20,166
Pachhimrath ...	502	503	...	13,721	16,394	9,353	7,781	47,249
Khandansa ...	128	128	...	6,562	7,890	4,213	3,533	22,198
Akbarpur ...	372	399	...	14,341	15,275	9,617	7,891	47,124
Majhora ...	245	266	...	7,340	8,270	5,209	4,260	25,079
Tanda ...	215	279	...	10,300	11,183	6,701	5 855	34,039
Birhar ...	392	520	...	10,736	12,184	7,913	6,653	37,488
Surharpur ...	235	238	...	8,525	8 936	6,040	5,564	29,065
	2567	2825	...	1,16,460	1,23,139	71,201	60,061	3,70,801
			European ...	...	...	...	...	...
			Native Christians,	...	...	...	...	...
			Prisoners with	...	...	...	...	...
			the Jail em- ployes.					
<i>Parganas trans- ferred to Sul- tanpur.</i>								
Aldemau ...	475	508	...	14,237	14,847	9,552	7,786	46,422
Sultanpur ...	460	460	...	15,172	17,026	9,880	8 308	50,386
Isauli ...	99	99	...	7,091	8,711	4,739	3,959	24,500
	1034	1067	...	36,500	40,584	24,171	20,353	1,21,308
	3601	3892	...	1,52,960	163,723	95,372	80,054	4,92,109

occupation, sex, and population—(concluded.)

LATIONS.					AVERAGE OF SOULS PER			Remarks.
TOTAL.					Houses.	Square mile.	Square mile of cultivation.	
Total.								
Adults.		Minors.		Total.				
Male.	Female.	Boys.	Girls.					
39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47
47,366	43,344	22,988	18,929	1,32,577	5	2,044	1,816	
29,426	32,155	17,021	14,253	92,855	6	800	1,272	
18,924	19,652	11,773	9,412	59,761	6	604	949	
65,565	69,123	41,530	34,642	2,10,880	6	604	1,070	
23,239	25,108	13,895	11,547	73,789	6	631	1,118	
42,277	43,020	27,668	23,190	1,36,155	6	518	1,047	
22,971	23,597	15,507	12,277	74,352	5	576	978	
23,814	25,069	15,616	13,644	78,143	5	630	1,070	
35,901	37,246	1,25,512	21,244	1,19,903	6	543	975	
26,791	25,626	17,649	15,359	85,425	6	593	1,095	
3,36,274	3,43,946	2,09,109	1,74,497	10,63,820	6	630	1,119	
1,013	155	101	138	1,407				
20	9	9	3	41				
1,194	49	17	..	1,260				
3,38,501	3,44,153	2,09,236	1,74,638	10,66,528				
52,141	50,708	33,497	27,019	1,63,365	5	522	1,054	
48,955	51,706	30,396	24,707	1,55,764	6	601	1,074	
16,879	19,118	10,554	8,749	55,300	6	636	1,177	
1,17,975	1,21,532	74,447	60,475	3,74,429	5	572	1,076	
4,56,476	4,65,685	2,83,683	2,35,113	14,40,957	5	614	1,108	

*No. IIIA.—Detail of castes*

Name of pargana.	Brahmin.	Chattri.	Kayeth.	Arkh.	Ahir.	Bári.	Badhai.	Barvár.	Pan mans.	Banjara.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Haweli Oudh,	13,313	13,516	3,246	...	16,326	226	1,580	173	15	...
Mangalsi ...	10,347	12,384	1,682	...	9,616	81	1,124	33	29	...
Amsin ...	9,616	7,447	547	...	5,829	94	573	...	4	12
Pachhimí áth...	38,682	20,190	2,970	55	32,779	704	2,892	...	170	...
Khandansa ...	14,572	9,554	682	..	11,678	121	1,000	3	...	...
Akharpur ...	13,891	9,489	1,796	...	10,127	99	1,413	...	4	...
Majhora ...	13,838	7,278	829	...	7,575	292	849	13	30	...
Tanda ...	5,797	5,058	1,231	...	3,867	75	945	7	101	...
Birhar ...	17,007	7,854	1,087	...	17,884	747	1,104	5	41	82
Surharpur ...	13,132	8,194	472	...	11,312	176	258	...	...	...
Total...	150,195	100,964	14,542	55	126,993	2,635	11,740	234	384	94
Aldema ...	28,054	19,630	1,861	69	15,194	795	729	14	...	...
Sultanpur ...	29,669	17,561	1,601	...	20,166	350	1,859	2	87	13
Isauli ...	8,991	6,893	773	...	10,352	156	637	...	30	...
Total...	66,714	44,104	4,235	69	45,712	1,211	3,225	16	177	13
GRAND TOTAL,	216,909	145,088	12,777	124	172,705	3,846	14,965	250	501	107

*in the Fyzabad district.*

Beldar.	Bairagi.	Bahelia.	Beria.	Bhat.	Bharia.	Bhar.	Bharthoja.	Bhotia	Pási.	Patabár.	Tarkehár.	Tamoli.
12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
133	2,080	159	97	443	414	...	1,390	...	5,990	127	...	1,062
...	72	...	20	752	...	...	2,019	...	10,411	52	5	1,314
...	...	2	2	239	15	855	307	...	293	59	...	443
104	188	424	316	1,455	191	4	4,418	...	7,527	242	..	5,167
...	20	71	16	329	8	4	1,577	...	5,409	35	32	492
39	148	139	80	850	5	10,333	565	...	270	65	...	477
...	13	30	26	252	...	2,270	219	...	61	41	...	72
322	372	...	52	461	43	675	230	133	952	39	...	422
...	566	163	8	746	115	1,910	84	...	645	18	...	656
5	99	94	87	..	...	4,071	295	...	153	4	...	312
603	3,558	1,082	704	6,027	791	20,152	11,143	133	31,801	682	37	10,717
...	...	160	3	1,041	8	690	1,520	...	241	137	...	361
43	31	65	157	1,545	6	8	1,904	...	3,215	66	2	650
14	...	182	28	264	...	14	930	...	1,994	44	...	290.
57	31	407	188	2,850	14	712	4,354	...	5,450	247	2	1,301
660	3,589	1,489	892	8,877	805	20,834	15,497	133	37,251	929	39	12,018

## No. IIIA.—Detail of castes

Name of pargana.	Teli.	Thái.	Thather.	Ját.	Jain.	Chamar.	Halwai.	Hajjam.	Dhobi.	Dharkár.	Ráj.
1	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35
Haweli Oudh,	2,461	...	767	7	...	13,113	994	2,379	1,608	338	84
Mangalsi ...	1,081	...	49	...	...	9,059	145	1,805	1,100	129	...
Amsin ...	985	...	34	78	..	9,692	94	905	757	117	...
Pachhimráth,	3,259	...	4	1,226	...	21,975	367	3,306	2,481	763	167
Khandansa ...	1,128	...	312	...	.	8,008	77	1,435	802	143	...
Akbarpur ...	1,933	3	65	79	...	26,769	353	2,396	2,027	366	36
Majhora ...	975	...	...	...	...	14,872	90	1,329	1,035	178	5
Tanda ...	972	...	100	4	...	14,099	279	1,318	1,321	189	58
Birhar ...	1,399	...	...	...	...	24,921	112	1,633	1,730	272	187
Burharpur ...	951	...	319	77	...	15,215	89	1,317	992	229	...
Total...	1,634	3	2,046	1,471	.	1,37,723	2,600	17,823	13,850	2,724	529
Aldemau ...	2,453	...	10	29	.	32,410	295	2,812	2,263	356	3
Sultanpur ...	1,984	...	17	163	8	25,140	230	2,698	1,889	92	10
Isauli ...	1,024	...	67	...	...	5,849	14	969	648	165	52
Total...	5,461	..	94	197	8	63,399	539	6,479	4,800	613	65
GRAND TOTAL,	21,495	3	2,140	1,668	8	2,21,122	3,139	24,302	18,650	3,337	594

*in the Fyzabad district—(continued.)*

Ranki.	Rangdhár.	Sikh.	Sonár.	Kalwár.	Khatrí.	Khatik.	Kahár.	Kurmi.	Kumbhár.	Kanjar.	Goshain.	Gaderia.
36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48
...	..	97	927	1,496	687	615	3,144	6,242	1,429	23	142	1,927
...	...	14	370	1,021	13	20	1,718	4,072	971	6	638	831
...	...	166	202	706	185	31	2,148	4,515	941	17	291	1,081
...	...	219	740	2,355	393	532	4,796	8,399	2,443	835	1,395	3,356
...	...	...	338	984	...	44	1,487	1,289	182	...	629	1,038
...	153	18	590	1,607	138	213	4,617	16,644	2,670	23	261	1,610
...	...	...	242	299	12	107	3,859	4,958	927	...	454	1,123
...	...	22	324	946	478	496	3,464	12,006	1,240	...	50	893
...	...	...	390	1,807	14	101	5,479	5,309	1,717	...	954	1,480
...	...	13	264	1,530	68	17	5,691	2,569	413	63	141	1,912
...	153	549	4,387	13,131	1,988	2,176	38,003	66,603	12,933	967	4,955	15,201
...	...	31	413	2,357	11	345	4,555	9,065	4,460	10	237	2,856
...	...	298	780	2,825	40	147	3,757	7,423	1,840	5	329	2,921
164	...	2	138	647	33	282	1,028	1,639	368	141	221	775
164	...	331	1,338	5,829	84	774	9,340	18,127	6,668	156	837	6,552
164	153	880	5,718	18,960	2,072	2,950	45,343	84,130	19,601	1,123	5,792	21,753



*No. IIIA.—Detail of castes*

Name of pargana.	Lohar.	Lodh.	Lonja.	Máli.	Malláh.	Marao.	Nat.	Sayad.	Sheikh.	Mughal.
1	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58
Haweli Oudh,	7,923	54	583	790	3,578	6,307	12	1,227	1,950	849
Mangalsi ...	793	557	697	252	2,999	4,061	141	521	783	151
Amsin ...	498	5	252	147	2,260	2,231	319	370	225	...
Pachhimráth,	2,227	284	1,738	463	8,673	7,323	698	522	375	137
Khandansa ...	670	810	495	38	446	32,006	70	17	1,098	18
Akbarpur ...	1,567	31	970	381	1,409	2,440	238	1,708	2,586	101
Majhora ...	663	...	211	90	1,701	1,148	77	51	209	112
Tanda ...	613	...	332	263	46	1,008	48	812	2,315	563
Birhar ..	1,590	...	1,867	272	3,534	1,836	174	351	4,582	31
Surharpur ...	1,452	...	713	174	2,236	1,260	119	133	344	...
Total...	10,996	1,741	7,858	2,875	27,884	30,320	1,896	5,712	14,467	1,962
Aldemau ...	2,456	52	1,618	199	10,598	1,846	141	289	566	38
Sultanpur ...	1,546	47	1,553	179	5,395	4,094	75	179	1,340	323
Isauli ...	468	...	72	150	1,012	1,844	86	481	1,089	130
Total...	4,490	99	3,243	528	17,005	7,784	302	949	2,995	491
GRAND TOTAL.	15,486	1,840	11,106	3,403	44,889	38,604	2,198	6,661	17,462	2,453

*in the Fyzabad district—(continued.)*

Pathān.	Bhathcara.	Bhaur.	Bhangi.	Jogi.	Jolaha.	Chhipi.	Khanzada.	Darzi.	Dafāli.	Dharhi.	Dhonia.	Rangrez.	Sikalgar.
59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72
3,113	94	50	706	331	2,565	80	...	753	...	17	7,527	...	43
2,218	120	14	95	34	1,284	1	581	684	133	...	1,029	110	42
140	44	8	64	3	2,084	...	...	209	...	...	1,192	...	...
1,112	9	87	...	170	574	761	116	694	328	5	3,944	25	...
885	...	6	59	...	267	3	...	174	70	...	821	19	5
2,283	63	...	242	257	5,108	67	...	571	116	...	1,713	32	7
602	...	220	81	571	712	...	...	276	31	...	1,238	...	99
1,226	29	86	165	32	5,686	...	...	429	467	...	3,304	185	24
3,379	11	...	79	31	1,729	142	23	192	286	...	1,302	10	32
678	64	6	52	32	4,999	3	...	264	100	...	1,039	24	7
15,636	443	477	1,543	1,461	25,308	1,057	720	4,246	1,531	22	23,109	355	252
1,412	29	38	139	286	3,227	...	...	678	...	...	3,070	...	...
1,669	55	2	181	302	1,347	120	...	733	400	4	2,710	...	...
1,446	...	5	150	57	532	...	...	286	37	13	605	20	17
4,527	84	45	470	645	5,106	120	...	1,697	437	17	6,385	20	17
20,168	537	522	2,013	2,106	30,414	1,177	720	5,943	1,968	39	29,494	375	269

*No. IIIA.—Detail of castes in the Fyzabad district—(concluded).*

Name of pargana.	Shakka.	Fakir.	Kasbi.	Kunkali.	Kingirha.	Kunjra.	Gojar.	Ghosi.	Madaria.	Mochi.	Manihar.	Hijra	REMARKS.
1	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85
Haweli Oudh,	282	51	141	...	...	724	...	348	...	126	227	6	
Mangalsi ...	...	407	183	51	63	380	281	...	...	2	181	73	
Amsin ...	...	172	99	47	...	34	5	34	...	...	90	...	
Pachhimrath,	...	774	41	..	...	90	172	709	...	69	694	27	
Khandansa ...	...	205	...	...	...	127	143	112	...	1	210	...	
Akbarpur ...	...	575	139	...	...	92	14	485	...	67	225	...	
Majhora ...	...	...	...	...	...	128	7	25	...	79	163	...	
Tanda ...	...	614	280	...	...	...	...	...	331	92	121	73	
Birhar ...	...	266	30	...	...	...	35	167	...	...	113	12	
Surharpur ...	...	444	275	...	...	16	...	124	...	173	158	7	
Total...	282	3,508	1,188	98	63	1,591	657	2,002	331	609	2,182	198	
Aldemau ...	...	345	41	...	...	146	...	202	...	83	403	...	
Sultanpur ...	183	624	208	..	...	46	4	58	...	13	402	84	
Isauli ...	...	79	120	..	10	92	...	224	...	53	371	10	
Total..	183	1,048	369	...	10	294	4	484	...	149	1,176	94	
GRAND TOTAL,	465	4,556	1,557	98	73	1,875	661	2,486	331	758	3,358	292	

## No. IV.—Statement of tenures, &amp;c.,

Name of tahsil.	Name of pargana.	TENURES AND NUMBERS OF VILLAGES, &c., OF EACH KIND.														NUMBER OF PROPRIETORS AND SUB PROPRIETORS.					AVERAGE AREA.				
		Talukdari.				Independent.				Number of Proprietors.				Number of Sub Proprietors.				Of land p. of Sir p.				Remarks.			
		Sub-settlement.		Villages not settled.		Zamindari.		Bhuyachari.		Total.		Number of Proprietors.		Number of Sub Proprietors.		Of land p. of Sir p.		Of land p. of Sir p.		Of land p. of Sir p.		Of land p. of Sir p.		Of land p. of Sir p.	
		Villages or tracts.	Smaller holdings.	Smaller holdings.	Smaller holdings.	Smaller holdings.	Smaller holdings.	Smaller holdings.	Smaller holdings.	Smaller holdings.	Smaller holdings.	Smaller holdings.	Smaller holdings.	Smaller holdings.	Smaller holdings.	Smaller holdings.	Smaller holdings.	Smaller holdings.	Smaller holdings.	Smaller holdings.	Smaller holdings.	Smaller holdings.	Smaller holdings.	Smaller holdings.	Smaller holdings.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
Fyzabad	Haveli Oudh	31	72	14	117	44	11	12	67	184	5	763	81	871	21	253	259	289							
	Mangalsi	27	41	2	70	16	27	1	44	111	1	1,323	93	1,350	255	162	294	198							
	Amsin	43	106	10	159	11	10	..	21	130			34	1,486	884	254	172	284							
	Total	101	219	26	346	71	48	13	132	478	14	2,907	208	4,157	247	27	251	247							
Bikapur	Pachhimrath	112	191	53	356	82	54	10	146	502	10	2,186	207	2,744	29	120	326	3							
	Khandansa	3	9	10	22	51	39	15	106	193	5	2,520	141	175	214	139	371	137							
	Total	115	200	63	378	133	93	26	252	630	14	4,706	348	2,919	210	134	349	298							
	Akbarpur	81	71	167	319	36	15	2	53	372	15	662	57	1,283	37	197	462	471							
Akbarpur	Majhora	95	50	26	171	34	36	4	74	245	16	737	59	2,621	236	191	684	274							
	Total	176	121	193	490	70	51	6	127	617	22	1,389	116	3,909	3	196	587	339							
	Tanda	25	23	65	113	63	34	...	102	215	15	573	91	348	349	277	638	546							
	Birhar	196	73	110	379	7	6	...	13	322	10	186	11	5,082	378	178	2094	283							
Tanda	Surharpur	57	35	75	167	16	52	...	68	235	15	409	45	1,307	253	139	890	375							
	Total	273	131	250	659	91	92	...	183	842	21	1,118	147	6,787	323	191	913	318							
	Total of district	670	671	532	1,873	365	234	45	694	2,567	35	10,120	819	17,722	264	184	422	32							
	Parganas transferred to Sultanpur.																								
Kadiapur	Aldemau	75	49	105	229	98	141	7	246	475	11	3,313	170	2,417	227	198	56	311							
	Sultanpur	121	110	56	237	75	30	68	173	460	15	3,262	171	3,854	3	155	264	230							
	Musafir Khana, Isuli	...	17	8	25	19	36	19	74	99	2	8,282	102	7	895	218	175	686							
	Total	196	176	169	541	192	207	94	493	1,034	20	9,807	443	6,278	270	180	318	262							
GRAND TOTAL		866	847	701	2,414	557	491	139	1,187	3,601	37	19,927	1,282	24,000	265	133	372	291							

\* The same talukdar sometimes own villages in two or more parganas, and hence the number of talukdars in a tahsil is not always the total of the numbers in its component parganas.

No. V.—General statement, *expla*

Name of pargana.	No. of mahals and of their compo- nent parts.		Total area.	Non-assessable.			
	Number of mahals.	Number of component parts.		Barren.	Groves less than 10 per cent.	Revenue-free.	Total.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
FYZABAD							
Haweli Oudh ...	57	240	81,198	15,626	4,818	4,802	25,246
Mangalsi ...	40	145	74,481	14,993	4,989	425	20,407
Amsin ...	26	216	63,151	10,964	2,949	599	14,512
Pachhimrāth ...	115	680	2,23,644	38,593	14,099	979	53,671
Khandausa ...	106	123	71,819	13,070	5,318	...	18,388
Akbarpur ...	56	478	1,68,183	55,106	4,736	1,038	60,880
Majhaura ...	17	625	82,589	16,761	3,212	751	20,724
Tanda ...	60	304	79,274	18,411	3,980	588	23,012
Birhar ...	22	928	1,41,379	31,839	5,567	...	37,406
Surharpur ...	38	468	92,256	25,306	2,523	158	27,987
Total ...	567	5,107	10,80,979	2,41,202	51,691	9,340	3,02,233
TRANSFERRED TO THE							
Aldemau ...	118	951	1,97,587	64,273	5,669	619	70,561
Sultanpur ...	103	581	1,65,809	30,762	10,584	...	41,346
Isauli ...	51	121	55,539	9,576	4,433	6	14,009
Total ...	272	1,656	4,18,935	1,04,611	20,686	619	1,25,916
GRAND TOTAL ...	839	6763	14,99,914	3,45,813	72,377	9,959	4,28,149

natory of the revised assessment.

Assessable.							Cultivators.		
Culturable.	Groves over 10 per cent.	CULTIVATION.				Total assessable.	Residents.	Non-residents.	Total.
		Irrigated by		Unirrigated.	Total cultivation				
		Wells.	Ponds.						
9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
DISTRICT.									
10,369	566	11,123	17,208	16,686	45,017	55,952	11,944	3,204	15,148
7,248	334	11,503	17,741	17,248	46,492	54,074	8,053	6,482	14,535
8,740	26	15,103	7,902	16,868	39,873	48,639	4,118	3,254	7,372
43,543	302	42,266	41,012	42,850	1,26,128	1,69,973	34,243	8,303	42,546
14,102	334	15,221	15,701	11,073	41,995	56,431	11,388	1,935	13,323
24,500	96	14,199	26,847	41,666	82,712	1,07,308	13,473	7,073	25,546
13,864	29	12,191	15,089	22,692	47,972	61,865	8,165	3,056	11,221
8,961	281	7,013	15,213	24,791	47,020	56,262	9,182	3,009	12,191
25,496	50	15,757	24,196	38,180	78,427	1,03,873	10,745	8,887	19,132
14,287	...	9,646	15,868	24,468	40,982	61,269	12,038	4,104	16,142
1,71,110	2,018	1,51,021	1,96,772	2,51,825	6,05,618	7,78,746	1,23,349	48,807	1,77,156
SULTANPUR DISTRICT.									
27,849	...	14,643	36,233	48,301	99,177	1,27,026	22,891	7,936	30,830
30,135	1,218	28,112	30,490	34,508	93,110	1,24,463	16,617	8,106	24,723
10,874	613	9,666	9,461	10,916	30,043	41,530	4,487	1,553	6,040
68,858	1,831	52,421	76,184	93,725	2,22,330	2,93,019	43,998	17,595	61,593
2,39,968	3,818	2,06,452	2,72,946	3,43,550	8,27,948	1,07,1,765	1,72,347	66,402	2,38,749

*No. V.—General statement, explanatory*

Name of pargana.	Number of				Detail of	
	Plough.	Cattle.	Lake, ponds &c.,	Wells.	Sir.	Other cultivation of proprietors.
1	19	20	21	22	23	24
<b>FYZABAD DIS</b>						
Haweli Oudh ...	9,046	41,342	2,052	3,777	12,863	...
Mangalsi ...	10,196	44,097	1,912	2,670	15,464	...
Amsin ...	8,152	35,420	1,481	1,730	16,647	...
Pachhimrath ...	26,664	1,25,972	7,202	9,410	44,460	...
Khandansa ...	9,225	38,541	2,363	2,892	13,953	...
Akbarpur ...	14,170	67,724	3,798	2,997	12,135	...
Majhaura ...	9,326	35,511	2,685	2,378	18,735	...
Tanda ...	7,778	33,976	1,800	1,510	8,194	...
Birhar ...	12,595	56,013	3,192	2,971	22,851	...
Surharpur ...	7,988	35,497	2,062	1,669	11,696	...
<b>Total</b> ...	<b>1,15,140</b>	<b>51,4,093</b>	<b>28,547</b>	<b>31,004</b>	<b>1,77,008</b>	<b>...</b>
<b>TRANSFERRED TO THE SUL</b>						
Aldemau ...	19,494	88,185	4,851	4,064	31,546	...
Sultanpur ...	18,419	85,158	5,212	5,637	31,275	...
Isauli ...	6,938	30,111	1,340	1,737	8,968	...
<b>Total</b> ...	<b>44,851</b>	<b>2,01,434</b>	<b>14,403</b>	<b>11,438</b>	<b>71,789</b>	<b>...</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b> ...	<b>1,59,991</b>	<b>7,15,527</b>	<b>39,950</b>	<b>42,442</b>	<b>2,48,797</b>	<b>...</b>

of the revised assessment—(continued).

cultivation.		Percentage of										The demand of summary settlement.
Resident cultivators.	Non-resident cultivators.	Cultivation.	Culturable.	Groves.	Barren.	1st class soil.	2nd class soil.	3rd class soil.	Irrigated	Manured.	Cultivation per cultivated.	
25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	
TRICT—(continued)												Rs. a. p.
24,051	8,095	55	14	6	25	67	22	11	63	28	2-12	74,673 3 0
20,532	10,469	62	11	7	20	66	22	12	63	34	2-13	47,831 4 6
14,977	8,249	63	14	5	18	63	25	12	58	35	3-15	50,447 15 6
71,655	10,013	56	20	6	18	58	38	4	66	34	1-92	1,96,996 12 4
24,376	3,661	56	19	7	18	69	21	10	74	40	2-10	50,785 0 0
56,650	13,927	49	15	3	33	45	39	16	50	16	2 76	1,18,227 2 6
23,390	5,847	58	17	4	21	72	23	5	57	25	2-61	70,748 11 0
32,002	6,824	59	12	5	24	41	35	24	47	16	3 18	60,344 0 0
40,631	14,945	55	18	4	23	52	38	10	51	24	2 90	93,552 0 0
30,510	7,776	54	16	3	27	57	28	15	51	30	2-37	66,491 12 0
3,38,777	89,833	56	16	5	23	53	31	11	58	27	2-42	8,70,097 12 10
TANPUR DISTRICT—(continued).												Rs. a. p.
51,925	15,706	50	14	3	33	52	30	18	51	21	2-19	1,37,842 12 0
49,240	12,586	56	19	6	19	70	17	13	63	34	2-50	1,44,392 14 3
17,717	3,358	54	21	8	17	66	20	14	64	37	3-49	56,217 6 6
1,18,891	31,650	53	17	5	25	61	23	16	58	29	2-44	3,38,453 0 9
4,57,668	1,21,483	55	17	5	23	59	29	12	58	27	2-43	12,08,550 13 7



## No. V.—General statement, explanatory

Name of pargana.	The net revised demand.	VARIATION			
		Increase.		Decrease.	
		Number of mauzas.	Amount.	Number of mauzas.	Amount.
1	38	39	40	41	42
FYSAHAD DIS					
	Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.
Hawali Oudh ...	a 97,504 11 9 b 92,571 0 0	a 156 b 145	a 21,267 7 9 b 19,931 13 0	a 25 b 36	a 1,435 15 0 b 2,034 0 0
Mangalsi ...	a 1,05,692 2 0 b 94,470 0 0	a 97 b 75	a 19,708 4 0 b 11,612 3 6	a 16 b 38	a 1,817 6 6 b 4,973 8 0
Amsiu ...	a 78,043 4 0 b 73,633 0 0	a 171 b 173	a 27,747 13 6 b 23,407 7 6	a 44 b 55	a 1,522 9 0 b 222 7 0
Pachhimrath ...	a 2,62,200 9 10 b 2,42 103 0 0	a 450 b 414	a 68,684 9 6 b 51,691 11 8	a 50 b 86	a 3,480 12 0 b 6,280 8 0
Khandansa ...	a 86,437 10 6 b 88,549 0 0	a 123 b 121	a 36,124 10 6 b 30,396 4 0	a 5 b 7	a 472 0 0 b 632 4 0
Akbarpur ...	a 1,71,970 3 0 b 1,66,926 0 0	a 349 b 343	a 57,105 7 6 b 49 127 4 6	a 21 b 27	a 362 7 0 b 428 7 0
Majhaura ...	a 97,912 15 10 b 89,136 0 0	a 215 b 211	a 28,437 5 10 b 19,860 5 0	a 28 b 32	a 1,273 1 0 b 1,173 0 0
Tanda ...	a 84,633 6 0 b 81,986 0 0	a 182 b 181	a 25,663 1 0 b 23,257 12 0	a 31 b 29	a 1,373 11 0 b 1,615 12 0
Brihar ...	a 1,49,466 4 84 b 1,41,453 0 0	a 382 b 382	a 57,563 4 84 b 52,579 0 0	a 10 b 10	a 1,619 0 0 b 1,678 0 0
Surharpur ...	a 98,940 9 0 b 94,330 0 0	a 224 b 221	a 32,839 3 0 b 28,249 4 0	a 10 b 13	a 390 6 0 b 411 0 0
Total ...	a 12,35,801 12 74 b 11,60,462 0 0	a 2,352 b 2,269	a 3,78,141 3 34 b 3,10,113 1 2	a 200 b 283	a 12,437 3 6 b 19,748 14 0
TRANSFERRED TO THE SUL.					
Aldemau ...	a 2,22,875 0 0 b 2,02,445 0 0	a 446 b 425	a 86,825 15 0 b 66,452 7 6	a 27 b 48	a 1,793 11 0 b 1,850 3 6
Sultanpur ...	a 1,91,613 6 1 b 1,82,180 0 0	a 117 b 397	a 53,964 15 10 b 41,592 7 9	a 43 b 63	a 6,744 8 0 b 3,805 6 0
Isauli ...	a 72,073 0 0 b 56,972 0 0	a 88 b 80	a 17,019 11 6 b 11,359 13 6	a 11 b 19	a 1,164 5 0 b 1,605 4 0
Total ...	a 4,86,561 6 1 b 4,50,597 0 0	a 951 b 902	a 1,57,810 13 4 b 1,19,404 12 9	a 18 b 130	a 9,702 8 0 b 7,260 13 6
GRAND TOTAL ...	a 17,22,363 2 84 b 16,11,059 0 0	a 3,303 b 3,171	a 5,35,952 0 74 b 4,29,517 13 11	a 281 b 413	a 22,139 11 6 b 27,009 11 6

NOTES.—The figures prefixed with letter *a* in columns 38 to 46 show the results

In columns 47 to 52, a single rate is shown for each class of land, there being

of the revised assessment—(concluded).

Rate per acre on.			Revised demand with cesses.	PARGANA RATES ON.					
Cultivation.	Culturable.	Total.		1st class.		2nd class.		3rd class.	
				Irrigated.	Unirrigated.	Irrigated.	Unirrigated.	Irrigated.	Unirrigated.
43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52
TRICI—(concluded).									
Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
a 2 2 8	a 1 11 11	a 1 3 3	a 99,940 0 0	7 0 4		4 5 3		1 14 4	
b 2 0 11	b 1 10 6	b 1 2 3	b 94,883 0 0						
a 2 4 4	a 1 15 3	a 1 6 8	a 1,08,330 0 0	6 11 7		4 0 5		1 12 6	
b 2 0 6	b 1 11 11	b 1 4 3	b 96,831 8 0						
a 1 15 4	a 1 9 8	a 1 3 9	a 79,995 0 0	6 1 2		3 15 9		1 8 10	
b 1 13 7	b 1 8 3	b 1 2 8	b 75,478 15 0						
a 2 1 3	a 1 8 8	a 1 2 9	a 2,68,755 14 0	6 11 6		3 14 9		1 14 1	
b 1 14 9	b 1 6 10	b 1 1 4	b 2,48,460 6 6						
a 2 0 11	a 1 8 6	a 1 2 6	a 88,600 0 0	6 2 3		3 6 11		1 12 1	
b 1 11 8	b 1 6 10	b 1 1 3	b 82,563 0 0						
a 2 1 10	a 1 10 1	a 1 0 8	a 1,79,351 12 0	7 0 0		4 6 5		2 0 0	
b 2 0 3	b 1 8 10	b 0 15 11	b 1,71,105 11 0						
a 2 0 8	a 1 9 4	a 1 3 0	a 1,00,360 12 10	6 13 0		4 3 0		1 13 0	
b 1 13 9	b 1 7 1	b 1 1 3	b 91,364 7 6						
a 1 12 10	a 1 8 1	a 1 1 1	a 86,750 0 0	6 4 9		3 12 9		1 11 4	
b 1 11 11	b 1 7 4	b 1 0 7	b 84,031 0 0						
a 1 14 6	a 1 7 0	a 1 0 11	a 1,53,205 0 0	6 5 4		4 3 2		2 6 0	
b 1 13 6	b 1 6 3	b 1 0 4	b 1,48,069 10 0						
a 1 15 8	a 1 8 8	a 1 11 2	a 1,01,415 0 0	7 1 9		4 2 9		2 2 9	
b 1 14 2	b 1 7 6	b 1 0 4	b 96,690 14 0						
a 2 0 8	a 1 9 5	a 1 2 3	a 1,266,703 6 10						
b 1 14 8	b 1 7 10	b 1 1 2	b 11,89,478 11 0						
TANPUR DISTRICT.—(concluded).									
a 2 3 11	a 1 12 1	a 1 2 1	a 2,28,447 0 0	7 6 0		4 9 6		2 2 2	
b 2 0 8	b 1 9 6	b 1 0 5	b 2,07,506 13 0						
a 2 8 11	a 1 8 8	a 1 2 6	a 1,96,404 3 7	6 7 9		3 12 0		1 8 8	
b 1 15 4	b 1 7 5	b 1 1 7	b 1,86,736 9 5						
a 2 6 5	a 1 11 9	a 1 4 9	a 73,875 0 0	7 6 6		4 4 2		2 0 9	
b 2 3 2	b 1 9 5	b 1 0 3	b 67,620 2 0						
a 2 3 0	a 1 10 7	a 1 2 7	a 4,98,726 3 7						
b 2 0 5	b 1 8 7	b 1 1 2	b 4,61,863 8 5						
a 2 1 3	a 1 9 9	a 1 2 4	a 17,65,429 10 5						
b 1 15 2	b 1 8 1	b 1 1 2	b 1,651,342 3 5						

of the original assessment, and those with *b* of the revision.

no recognized distinction between the rates on "irrigated" and those on "unirrigated."

*No. Va.—Statement showing*

Name of pargana.	<i>Jama originally proposed.</i>		<i>Jama</i>	
	Rasli.	Full.	1273 fasli.	1274 fasli.
1	2	3	4	5
	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
				F Y Z A
Haweli Oudh ...	99,940 0 0	99,940 0 0	76,539 3 0	76,541 3 0
Mangalsi ...	1,08,330 0 0	1,08,330 0 0	90,026 4 3	90,028 4 3
Amsin ...	79,995 0 0	79,995 0 0	51,707 15 6	51,707 15 6
Pachhimrath ...	2,68,755 14 0	2,68,755 14 0	2,01,920 12 4	2,01,920 12 4
Khandansa ...	73,240 0 0	83,600 0 0	52,054 0 0	52,054 0 0
Akbarpur ...	1,74,201 12 0	1,79,351 12 0	1,25,632 12 6	1,30,334 14 6
Majhora ...	99,095 12 10	1,00,360 12 10	75,454 11 6	87,510 8 0
Tanda ...	86,750 0 0	86,750 0 0	61,851 0 0	76,110 0 0
Birhar ...	1,53,205 0 0	1,53,205 0 0	95,891 10 0	1,52,290 1 0
Sunharpur ...	1,01,415 0 0	1,01,415 0 0	68,152 12 0	1,01,407 0 0
Total ...	12,44,928 6 10	12,66,703 6 10	8,99,231 0 7	10,19,904 10 7
				PARGANAHS TRANSFER
Aldemau ...	2,03,182 0 0	2,28,447 0 0	1,97,594 11 0	2,02,142 7 0
Sultapur ...	1,96,404 3 7	1,96,404 3 7	1,48,002 14 3	1,48,002 14 3
Isauli ...	73,875 0 0	73,875 0 0	57,622 6 6	57,622 6 6
Total ...	4,73,461 3 7	4,98,726 3 7	4,03,219 15 9	4,07,767 11 9
GRAND TOTAL,	17,18,389 10 5	17,65,429 10 5	13,02,451 0 4	14,27,672 6 4

*progressive jamas.**now proposed.*

1275 fasli.	1276 fasli.	1277 fasli.	1278 fasli.	1279 fasli.
6	7	8	9	10
Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
<b>B A D .</b>				
76,541 3 0	76,541 3 0	97,907 12 0	97,907 12 0	97,907 12 0
90,028 4 3	90,028 4 3	1,07,559 12 0	1,07,559 12 0	1,07,559 12 0
78,964 0 0	78,964 0 0	78,479 0 0	78,479 0 0	78,479 0 0
2,01,920 12 4	2,01,920 12 4	2,53,212 0 0	2,63,495 10 0	2,63,495 10 0
52,054 0 0	52,054 0 0	54,588 14 0	72,700 0 0	72,700 0 0
1,72,709 9 0	1,72,709 9 0	1,71,590 2 0	1,71,590 2 0	1,71,590 2 0
92,960 8 0	92,960 8 0	92,960 8 0	95,997 14 10	96,060 14 10
86,750 0 0	86,750 0 0	86,750 0 0	86,750 0 0	86,750 0 0
1,53,205 0 0	1,53,105 0 0	1,53,205 0 0	1,53,205 0 0	1,53,205 0 0
1,01,407 0 0	1,01,307 0 0	1,01,407 0 0	1,01,407 0 0	1,00,899 12 0
11,06,540 4 7	11,06,540 4 7	11,97,660 0 0	12,29,092 2 10	12,28,647 14 10
<b>RED TO SULTANPUR</b>				
2,02,142 7 0	2,02,142 7 0	2,02,142 7 0	2,02,142 7 0	2,02,142 7 0
1,48,002 14 3	1,48,002 14 3	1,48,002 14 3	1,93,826 6 3	1,93,826 6 3
57,622 6 6	57,622 6 6	57,622 6 6	73,875 0 0	73,875 0 0
4,07,767 11 9	4,07,767 11 9	4,07,767 11 9	4,69,843 13 3	4,69,843 13 3
15,14,308 0 4	15,14,308 4 0	16,05,427 11 9	16,98,936 0 1	16,98,491 12 1

*No. Va.—Statement showing*

Name of pargana.	<i>Jama now</i>			
	1280 fasli.	1281 fasli.	1282 fasli.	1283 fasli.
	11	12	13	14
	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
<b>FYZABAD—</b>				
Haveli Oudh ...	97,907 12 0	97,757 12 0	97,227 0 0	93,340 0 0
Mangalsi ...	1,07,559 12 0	1,05,849 4 0	1,03,568 12 0	95,627 8 0
Amsin ...	78,479 0 0	78,091 8 0	77,090 12 0	77,090 12 0
Pachhimrāth ...	2,62,609 12 3	2,61,859 12 3	2,58,407 14 3	2,43,406 12 6
Khandānsa ...	72,700 0 0	72,700 0 0	72,700 0 0	72,700 0 0
Akbarpur ...	1,71,559 2 0	1,70,587 8 0	1,69,447 2 0	1,69,447 2 0
Majhaura ...	95,320 6 10	94,656 7 10	93,794 14 10	89,819 8 10
Tānda ...	86,750 0 0	86,750 0 0	86,750 0 0	86,750 0 0
Birhar ...	1,53,205 0 0	1,53,205 0 0	1,53,205 0 0	1,53,205 0 0
Surharpur ...	1,00,899 12 0	1,00,887 0 0	95,376 14 0	95,376 14 0
<b>Total ...</b>	<b>12,26,990 9 1</b>	<b>12,22,344 4 1</b>	<b>12,07,568 5 1</b>	<b>11,76,763 9 4</b>
<b>PARGANAS TRANSFERRED</b>				
Aldemau ...	2,01,986 5 0	2,01,652 9 0	2,01,242 15 0	1,91,732 1 0
Sultanpur ...	1,93,826 6 3	1,93,207 0 3	1,90,371 1 3	1,90,371 1
Isauli ...	73,875 0 0	73,875 0 0	73,375 2 0	73,375 2 0
<b>Total ...</b>	<b>4,69,687 11 3</b>	<b>4,68,734 9 3</b>	<b>4,64,989 2 3</b>	<b>4,55,478 4 3</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL,</b>	<b>16,96,678 4 4</b>	<b>16,91,078 13 4</b>	<b>16,72,557 7 4</b>	<b>16,32,241 13 7</b>

*progressive jamas—(continued).**proposed—(continued).*

1284 fasli.	1285 fasli.	1286 fasli.	1287 fasli.	1288 fasli.
15	16	17	18	19
Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
<i>(continued).</i>				
93,340 0 0	93,340 0 0	93,863 0 0	94,848 0 0	94,848 0 0
95,627 8 0	95,627 8 0	95,871 12 0	96,831 8 0	96,831 8 0
72,149 10 0	72,861 9 0	73,077 9 0	73,127 15 0	75,053 9 0
2,43,541 13 6	2,43,707 13 6	2,46,512 3 6	2,47,855 5 6	2,48,025 1 6
72,700 0 0	72,135 4 0	72,135 4 0	72,135 4 0	82,563 0 0
1,69,725 8 0	1,64,809 8 3	1,66,555 8 3	1,67,141 3 3	1,71,013 7 0
89,840 0 10	89,922 0 10	90,136 0 10	90,296 1 10	91,343 15 6
81,368 0 0	81,368 0 0	81,368 0 0	84,031 0 0	84,031 0 0
1,34,932 4 0	1,34,932 4 0	1,34,932 4 0	1,48,069 10 0	1,48,069 10 0
95,376 14 0	95,376 14 0	95,426 11 0	96,417 14 0	96,417 14 0
11,48,601 10 4	11,44,080 13 7	11,49,878 7 7	11,70,753 13 7	11,88,197 1 0
TO SULTANPUR— <i>(continued).</i>				
1,91,494 5 0	1,97,222 11 0	2,05,473 1 0	2,06,423 11 0	2,06,483 11 0
1,80,487 6 10	1,80,487 6 10	1,80,805 2 10	1,85,554 14 3	1,86,611 9 5
65,906 2 0	65,906 2 0	65,906 2 0	67,620 2 0	67,620 2 0
4,37,887 13 10	4,43,616 3 10	4,52,184 5 10	4,59,598 11 3	4,60,715 6 5
15,86,489 8 2	15,87,697 1 5	16,02,062 13 5	16,30,352 8 10	16,48,912 7 5

*No. Va.—Statement showing progress of jama—(concluded).*

Name of pargana.	<i>Jama now proposed—(concluded.)</i>			
	1289 fasli.	1290 fasli.	1291 fasli.	1292 fasli.
	20	21	22	23
	Rs.   a. p.	Rs.   a. p.	Rs.   a. p.	Rs.   a. p.
<b>FYZABAD—(concluded).</b>				
Haweli Oudh ...	94,883   0   0	94,883   0   0	94,883   0   0	94,883   0   0
Mangalsi ...	96,831   8   0	96,831   8   0	96,831   8   0	96,831   8   0
Amsin ...	75,258   9   0	75,258   9   0	75,340   9   0	75,478   15   0
Pachhimrāth ...	2,48,025   1   6	2,48,025   1   6	2,48,373   9   6	2,48,460   9   6
Khandānsa ...	28,563   0   0	82,563   0   0	82,563   0   0	82,563   0   0
Akbarpur ...	1,71,013   7   0	1,71,013   7   0	1,71,013   7   0	1,71,105   11   0
Majhaura ...	91,343   15   6	91,343   15   6	91,364   7   6	91,364   7   6
Tānda ...	84,031   0   0	84,031   0   0	84,031   0   0	84,031   0   0
Birlhar ...	1,48,069   10   0	1,48,069   10   0	1,48,069   10   0	1,48,069   10   0
Surharpur ...	96,417   14   0	96,417   14   0	96,545   14   0	96,690   14   0
<b>Total ...</b>	<b>11,88,437   1   0</b>	<b>11,88,437   1   0</b>	<b>11,89,016   1   0</b>	<b>11,89,478   11   0</b>

**PARGANAS TRANSFERRED TO SULTANPUR—(concluded).**

Aldemau	2,07,379   5   0	2,07,425   13   0	2,07,425   13   0	2,07,506   13   0
Sultanpur ...	1,86,611   9   5	1,86,611   9   5	1,86,736   9   5	1,86,736   9   5
Isauli ...	67,620   2   0	67,620   2   0	67,620   2   0	67,620   2   0
<b>Total ...</b>	<b>4,61,611   0   5</b>	<b>4,61,657   8   5</b>	<b>4,61,782   8   5</b>	<b>4,61,863   8   5</b>
<b>GRAND TOTAL,</b>	<b>16,50,048   1   5</b>	<b>16,50,094   9   5</b>	<b>16,50,798   9   5</b>	<b>16,51,342   3   5</b>

*Note*—Details of land revenue and cesses are omitted in this statement, as it is already long without them.

*No. Vb.—General statement explanatory of the revised assessment,  
according to the original assessment circles.*

Name of pargana.	Number of circle.	Number of mahals and of their component parts.		Total area	Non-assessable.			
		Number of mahals.	Number of component parts.		Barren.	Groves less than 10 per cent.	Revenue free.	Total.
1		2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Haweli Oudh	...	I	...	6,100	441	100	4,802	5,343
		II	...	3,115	574	273	...	847
		III	...	58,600	8,665	4,362	...	13,027
		IV	...	14,459	6,547	83	...	6,630
		...	...	81,734	16,227	4,818	4,802	25,847
Mangalsi	...	I	...	80,690	16,464	5,406	425	22,295
Amsin	...	I	...	64,340	10,562	2,441	591	13,994
		II	...	3,971	1,087	206	...	1,293
		...	...	68,311	11,649	3,047	591	15,287
Pachhimráth	...	I	...	20,457	3,277	1,301	...	4,578
		II	...	119,637	19,825	7,974	299	28,098
		III	...	43,548	8,375	2,096	681	11,752
		...	...	183,642	31,477	11,371	980	43,828
Khandánsa	...	I	...	69,005	11,753	4,740	...	16,493
Akbarpur	...	I	...	64,006	15,083	2,765	328	18,176
		II	...	83,438	27,178	2,384	568	30,130
		III	...	26,282	6,677	650	...	7,327
		...	...	173,726	48,938	5,799	896	55,633



*No. Vb.—General statement explanatory of the revised assessment, according to the original assessment circles—(continued).*

Name of pargana.		Number of circle.	Number of mahals and of their component parts.		Total area.	Non-assessable.			
			Number of mahals.	Number of component parts.		Barren.	Groves less than 10 per cent.	Revenue free.	Total.
1		2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Majhaura	...	I	...	...	46,888	9,938	1,896	209	12,034
Tanda	...	I	...	...	42,929	8,383	2,405	729	11,517
		II	...	...	12,969	4,414	610	...	5,024
Manjha now assessed,	...	...	...	...	2,913	1,041	...	...	1,041
					58,751	13,838	3,015	729	17,582
Birhar	...	I	...	...	46,105	9,595	2,517	...	12,112
Manjha Khamhain and Arazi Dewara.	...	...	...	...	4,133	1,327	...	...	1,327
		II	...	...	60,686	12,401	2,429	...	14,630
		III	...	...	32,076	8,541	592	...	9,133
					143,000	31,864	5,538	...	37,402
Surharpur	...	I	...	...	29,841	7,549	1,050	..	8,599
		II	...	...	25,255	8,092	571	158	8,821
		III	...	..	39,423	16,167	659	...	16,826
					94,519	31,808	2,280	158	34,246

No. Vb.—General statement explanatory of the revised assessment, according to the original assessment circles—(continued).

Name of pargana.	Number of circle.	Number of mahals and of their component parts.		Total area.	Non-assessable.			
		Number of mahals.	Number of component parts.		Barren.	Groves less than 10 per cent.	Revenue free.	Total.
1		2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Aldeman	...	I	...	52,674	20,176	942	...	21,118
		II	...	37,487	12,007	649	619	13,328
		III	...	38,900	8,886	1,697	...	10,583
		IV	...	31,511	8,079	1,239	...	9,318
		V	...	28,979	12,647	501	...	13,148
		VI	...	35,620	10,494	943	...	11,437
				2,25,171	72,342	5,971	619	78,932
Sultanpur	...	I	...	61,591	10,241	4,461	...	14,702
		II	...	39,675	7,013	2,844	...	9,857
		III	...	73,314	14,159	3,603	550	18,312
		IV	...	45,291	9,565	2,799	...	12,364
				2,19,871	40,978	13,707	550	55,235
Isauli	...	I	...	21,452	3,435	1,689	...	5,421
		II	...	33,993	6,240	2,408	...	4,648
				55,445	9,675	4,394	...	14,069

## No. Vb.—General statement explanatory of the revised assess

Name of pargana.		Number of circle.	ASSESSABLE.						
			Culturable.	Groves over 10 per cent.	CULTIVATION.			Total assessable.	
					Irrigated by		Unirrigated.		Total cultivation.
					Wells.	Ponds.			
1		9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
Haweli Oudh ...	I	67	87	479	5	119	603	757	
	II	96	93	526	608	945	2,079	2,268	
	III	5,470	386	11,024	15,906	12,247	39,177	45,033	
	IV	4,531	...	39	26	3,233	3,298	7,829	
		10,164	566	12,068	16,545	16,544	45,157	55,887	
Mangalsi ...	I	8,053	360	12,842	18,017	18,123	49,982	58,395	
Amsin ...	I	10,266	26	15,894	8,278	15,882	40,054	50,346	
	II	164	...	143	253	2,118	2,514	2,678	
		10,430	26	16,037	8,531	18,000	42,568	53,024	
Pachhimráth ...	I	4,032	17	3,906	4,951	2,973	11,830	15,879	
	II	21,625	154	21,688	25,960	23,012	69,760	91,539	
	III	10,625	11	8,186	5,534	8,040	21,760	32,396	
		36,282	182	33,780	35,545	34,025	103,350	1,39,814	
Khandánsa ...	I	13,618	318	14,016	14,439	10,121	38,576	52,512	
Akbarpur ...	I	8,235	48	5,151	11,359	20,987	37,497	45,830	
	I	12,711	96	6,502	13,946	20,053	40,501	53,308	
	II	4,855	...	2,782	4,064	7,254	14,100	18,955	
	III								
		25,851	144	14,435	29,369	48,294	92,098	1,18,093	
Majhaura ...	I	7,981	12	6,623	8,034	12,204	26,861	34,854	
Tánda ...	I	4,404	198	4,376	10,221	12,213	26,810	31,412	
	II	1,012	106	1,010	1,958	3,799	6,767	7,885	
Manjha now assessed.	...	1,300	...	...	...	572	572	1,872	
		6,716	304	5,386	12,179	16,584	34,149	41,169	

ment, according to the original assessment circles—(continued).

Cultivators.			Number of				Detail of cultivation.			
Residents.	Non-residents.	Total.	Ploughs.	Cattle.	Lakes, ponds, &c	Wells.	Sir.	Other cultivation of proprietors.	Resident cultivators.	Non-resident cultivators.
16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
736	126	865	278	2,023	11	242	59	...	406	138
999	111	1,110	526	1,373	54	132	914	...	1,020	145
29,160	2,763	31,923	8,242	37,943	1,332	1,357	11,895	...	22,768	4,514
...	204	204	1	3	...	7	...	...	...	3,298
30,898	3,204	34,102	9,047	41,342	1,097	1,738	12,868	...	24,194	8,095
40,527	6,647	47,174	11,130	47,420	1,500	1,816	16,465	...	22,673	10,844
26,435	2,966	29,401	8,364	36,482	1,196	1,361	16,026	...	16,777	7,551
978	363	1,341	299	1,520	20	18	1,046	...	614	854
27,463	3,329	30,792	8,663	38,002	1,216	1,379	17,072	...	17,091	8,405
10,887	902	11,789	3,049	29,232	508	562	3,150	...	7,305	1,355
52,697	4,631	57,328	15,450	49,783	2,681	3,913	25,931	...	39,913	3,916
14,000	1,455	15,455	4,180	26,208	727	990	7,177	...	11,966	2,077
77,584	6,988	84,572	22,680	105,223	3,916	5,465	36,198	...	59,204	7,948
28,467	1,811	30,278	8,418	35,534	1,619	2,002	13,082	...	2,236	3,358
17,517	2,345	19,862	6,019	25,572	1,060	664	8,062	...	29,496	4,939
22,070	4,385	26,455	6,904	32,235	1,178	988	5,049	...	27,643	7,809
6,755	921	7,676	2,232	9,591	452	278	2,064	...	10,336	1,700
46,342	7,651	53,993	15,155	67,398	2,690	1,930	10,175	...	67,475	14,448
16,781	1,610	18,391	5,642	22,140	900	915	14,153	...	9,336	3,372
14,272	1,871	16,143	4,817	21,381	884	564	6,884	...	13,207	4,719
3,173	365	3,538	1,037	4,590	124	97	1,098	...	1,956	683
...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	572	...
17,445	2,286	19,681	5,854	25,971	1,008	661	7,982	...	20,765	5,402

## No. VI. — General statement explanatory of the revised assess

Name of pargana.		Number of circle.	ASSESSABLE.						
			Culturable.	Groves over 10 per cent.	CULTIVATION.				Total assessable.
					Irrigated by		Unirrigated.	Total cultivation.	
					Wells.	Ponds.			
1		9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
Birhar ... Manjha Khamhain and Arazi Dewara.	I	3,810	97	7,948	10,593	12,445	30,086	33,993	
	...	2,102	...	...	...	704	704	2,806	
	II	11,841	16	5,594	10,355	18,050	33,999	45,856	
	III	8,470	...	3,208	3,906	7,359	14,473	22,943	
		26,223	113	15,650	24,854	38,558	79,262	105,598	
Surharpur	I	4,122	...	3,360	6,093	7,667	17,120	21,242	
	...	3,174	...	2,347	4,299	6,614	13,260	16,434	
	II	4,228	...	3,008	6,490	8,571	18,069	22,597	
	III								
		11,824	...	8,715	16,882	22,552	48,449	60,273	
Aldemau	I	8,753	...	2,887	9,712	10,204	22,803	31,556	
	...	6,208	...	1,670	8,005	8,276	17,951	24,159	
	II	4,891	...	4,851	8,008	10,567	23,426	28,317	
	III	3,262	...	3,355	3,277	11,619	18,231	22,193	
	IV	4,539	...	1,662	4,557	5,073	11,292	15,831	
	V	5,406	...	3,361	6,350	9,066	18,777	24,183	
		33,759	...	17,766	39,909	54,805	1,12,483	146,239	
Sultanpur	I	10,329	757	12,848	13,434	9,521	35,803	46,889	
	...	8,824	209	7,423	6,642	6,720	20,785	29,818	
	II	11,902	129	13,093	14,417	15,461	42,971	55,002	
	III	7,333	248	5,894	4,854	14,298	25,046	32,927	
		38,688	1,343	39,058	39,347	46,000	1,24,605	164,636	
Isauli	I	3,084	506	4,120	3,515	4,806	12,441	16,031	
	...	7,679	106	5,546	6,109	5,905	17,560	25,345	
	II								
		10,763	612	9,666	9,624	10,711	30,001	41,376	

ment, according to the original assessment circles—(continued).

Cultivators.			Number of				Detail of cultivation.			
Residents.	Non-residents.	Total.	Ploughs.	Cattle.	Lakes, ponds, &c.	Wells.	Acres.	Other cultivation of proprietors.	Resident cultivators.	Non-resident cultivators.
16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
15,497	2,957	18,454	4,437	19,161	704	736	11,179	...	14,065	4,842
8	205	213	...	95	...	...	...	...	34	670
18,993	3,868	22,861	5,947	22,830	825	770	7,499	...	20,198	6,302
5,956	1,235	7,191	2,055	13,990	313	288	4,881	...	6,603	2,939
40,454	8,265	48,719	12,439	56,076	1,842	1,794	23,559	...	40,900	14,803
9,098	1,468	10,566	2,724	11,585	504	544	3,601	...	10,811	2,708
6,844	979	7,823	2,090	9,069	327	274	4,192	...	7,083	1,985
9,574	1,115	10,689	2,970	17,464	448	339	4,606	...	10,922	2,541
25,516	3,562	29,078	7,784	38,418	1,279	957	12,399	..	28,816	7,234
14,113	1,505	15,618	4,605	18,913	689	480	6,326	...	14,180	2,297
9,551	1,283	10,834	3,416	13,882	411	261	6,062	...	8,710	3,179
14,633	1,901	16,534	4,676	18,352	619	622	7,586	...	13,063	2,777
12,555	895	13,450	4,022	16,554	202	549	5,921	...	9,714	2,596
6,629	1,732	8,361	2,177	11,518	349	272	2,967	...	4,343	3,982
11,898	1,928	13,826	3,552	19,192	624	580	6,741	...	8,660	3,376
69,379	9,244	78,623	22,448	98,411	2,927	2,764	35,603	...	58,670	18,207
25,276	3,305	28,581	7,510	35,289	1,556	1,532	13,922	...	16,777	5,104
15,541	1,257	16,798	4,295	14,575	804	1,050	7,969	...	10,946	1,870
26,749	4,001	30,750	7,297	39,895	1,801	1,723	14,086	...	22,592	6,293
15,652	1,739	17,391	5,003	19,722	375	766	4,296	...	18,008	2,742
83,218	10,302	93,520	24,105	109,481	4,536	5,071	40,273	...	68,323	16,009
8,280	526	8,806	3,157	12,742	386	569	2,771	...	3,524	1,146
11,847	1,027	12,874	3,767	17,369	581	752	6,197	...	9,151	2,212
20,127	1,553	21,680	6,924	30,111	967	1,321	8,968	...	17,675	3,358

## No. Vb.—General statement explanatory of the revised assess

Name of pargana.	Number of circle.	Percentage of									Cultivation per cultiva- tor.
		Cultivation.	Culturable.	Groves.	Barren.	First class soil.	Second class soil.	Third class soil.	Irrigated.	Manured.	
1		27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36
											A. r. p.
Haweli Oudh	I	10	3	1	86	93	...	7	86	88	0 2 23
	II	67	6	9	18	78	13	9	54	33	2 0 6
	III	67	11	7	15	72	23	5	66	35	2 2 33
	IV	23	31	...	46	72	2	26	5	6	...
		55	13	6	26	71	24	5	66	24	2 2 20
Mangalsai	I	62	10	7	21	66	22	12	64	35	1 0 31
Amsin	I	62	16	4	18	64	28	8	60	35	1 2 2
	II	63	4	5	28	50	4	46	16	17	2 2 11
		62	16	4	18	64	26	10	58	34	1 2 8
Pachhimráth	I	58	20	6	16	59	36	7	75	32	1 0 13
	II	58	18	7	17	61	36	3	67	35	1 1 11
	III	50	24	5	21	55	34	7	63	33	1 2 8
		56	20	5	19	60	36	4	67	34	1 1 12
Khandánsa	I	56	20	7	17	70	20	10	73	41	1 1 17
Akbarpur	I	59	13	4	24	42	39	19	44	14	2 0 22
	II	49	15	3	33	42	37	21	50	15	1 3 13
	III	54	19	2	25	45	38	17	48	18	2 0 14
		53	15	3	29	43	38	19	48	16	1 3 38
Majhaura	I	57	18	4	21	81	14	5	55	23	1 2 11
Tánda	I	62	11	6	2	42	48	10	54	17	1 3 18
	II	52	9	5	34	23	11	66	43	16	2 0 21
Manjha now assess- ed.	...	20	44	...	36	...	...	100	...	...	...
		58	12	5	25	38	41	21	52	17	1 3 26

The figures marked "a" denote the present

ment, according to the original assessment circles—(continued).

The demand of summary settlement.	The net revised demand.	VARIATION.				Rate per acre on		
		Increase.		Decrease.		Cultivation.	Culturable.	Total.
		Number of mauzas.	Amount.	Number of mauzas.	Amount.			
37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45
4,047 10 5	4 307	8	528 9 7	2	269 4 0	7 2 3	5 11 0	0 11 4
4,875 0 0	5,171	4	413 0 0	2	117 0 0	2 7 10	2 4 6	1 10 7
65,066 2 5	83,188	139	18,530 10 7	22	1,008 13 0	2 2 0	1 13 7	1 6 11
84 6 2	4,839	3	4,771 12 10	1	17 3 0	1 7 6	0 9 11	0 5 4
74,673 3 0	97,505 92,571 <sup>a</sup>	154	24,244 1 0	27	1,412 4 0	2 2 7	1 11 11	1 3 1
92,619 4 6	1,13,475 1,01,448 <sup>a</sup>	95	22,481 11 6	18	1,626 0 0	2 4 4	1 15 1	1 6 6
51,161 9 6	80,107	176	29,069 0 6	2	123 10 0	2 0 0	1 9 5	1 3 11
2,264 0 0	3,215	9	1,023 6 0	1	72 6 0	1 4 6	1 3 3	0 12 11
53,425 9 6	83,322 78,357 <sup>a</sup>	185	30,092 6 6	3	196 0 0	1 15 4	1 9 2	1 3 6
22,617 10 7	27,037	33	5,636 6 5	10	717 1 0	2 5 3	1 9 11	1 5 6
1,08,731 3 9	1,45,546	265	38,516 3 0	31	1,711 4 0	2 1 0	1 9 5	1 3 6
31,038 0 0	43,385	68	12,848 7 0	6	501 7 0	1 15 11	1 5 5	0 15 11
1,62,386 14 4	2,16,463 1,99,826 <sup>a</sup>	366	57,010 13 8	47	2,929 12 0	2 1 6	1 8 9	1 2 11
46,552 0 0	79,274 74,178 <sup>a</sup>	111	33,366 1 0	7	644 1 0	2 0 11	1 3 1	1 2 5
49,435 8 0	76,561	138	27,219 3 0	2	93 11 0	2 0 8	1 10 9	1 3 2
59,013 8 0	84,863	161	26,062 3 0	11	212 11 0	2 1 6	1 9 6	1 0 3
18,444 0 0	26,805	50	8,361 0 0	...	...	1 14 5	1 6 8	1 0 4
1,26,893 0 0	1,88,229 1,01,461 <sup>a</sup>	349	61,642 6 0	13	306 6 0	2 0 8	1 9 6	1 1 4
43,391 3 3	55,946 52,067 <sup>a</sup>	143	13,282 12 9	20	728 0 0	2 1 4	1 9 8	1 3 1 1 1 6
36,152 8 0	46,935	119	11,264 8 0	14	482 0 0	1 12 0	1 7 11	
8,090 0 0	10,324	30	2,514 0 0	3	280 0 0	1 8 5	1 4 11	0 12 10
577 0 0	1,283	...	706 0 0	...	...	2 3 4	0 11 0	0 7 1
44,819 8 0	58,582 57,860	149	14,484 8 0	17	762 0 0	1 11 5	1 6 9	0 15 11



## No. Vb.—General statement explanatory of the revised assess

Name of pargana.		Number of circle.	Percentage of									
			Cultivation.	Culturable.	Groves.	Barren.	First class soil.	Second class soil.	Third class soil.	Irrigated.	Manured.	Cultivation per cultivator.
1			27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36
												A. r. p.
Birhar	...	I	65	9	5	21	54	33	13	58	25	1 3 33
	...	II	17	51	...	32	...	100	...	...	...	...
	Manjha Khambhai	III	56	19	4	21	52	38	10	47	23	1 3 6
	and Araz Dewara.	III	45	26	2	27	49	47	4	49	26	2 1 30
			57	17	4	22	52	39	9	51	24	1 3 31
Surharpur	...	I	58	14	3	25	64	18	18	55	21	1 3 20
	...	II	56	12	2	30	64	26	10	50	23	1 1 37
	...	III	46	12	1	41	53	36	11	55	23	1 3 22
	...	III	51	12	2	35	61	26	13	53	21	1 4 30
Aldemau	...	I	44	16	2	38	53	44	3	55	19	1 2 18
	...	II	47	17	2	34	42	56	2	54	22	1 3 20
	...	III	61	13	4	22	66	26	8	59	29	1 2 13
	...	IV	58	12	4	26	61	8	31	36	25	1 1 32
	...	V	39	16	2	43	64	24	12	55	18	1 2 32
	...	VI	53	15	2	30	65	34	1	51	22	1 3 11
			49	14	4	33	59	32	9	51	23	1 2 10
Sultanpur	...	I	58	18	7	17	78	21	1	74	54	1 1 27
	...	II	52	23	7	18	60	37	3	67	41	1 1 14
	...	III	59	16	5	20	55	44	1	64	33	1 2 16
	...	IV	56	17	6	21	69	8	23	43	31	1 2 6
			57	18	6	19	65	29	6	63	34	1 1 39
Isauli	...	I	58	17	9	16	79	9	12	62	40	1 2 0
	...	II	52	23	7	18	73	19	8	66	36	1 1 37
	...	II	54	21	8	17	76	15	9	64	37	1 1 38

The figures marked "a" denote the present

ment, according to the original assessment circles—(continued).

The demand of summary settle- ment.	The net revised demand.	VARIATION.				Rate per acre on		
		Increase.		Decrease.		Cultivation.	Culturable.	Total.
		Number of mau- zas.	Amount.	Number of mau- zas.	Amount.			
37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45
38,573 0 0	58,244	168	19,325 2 0	5	154 2 0	1 15 0	1 11 5	1 4 3
3,000 0 0	2,220	...	146 0 0	1	926 0 0	3 2 5	0 12 8	0 8 7
36,380 0 0	63,785	152	27,495 12 0	2	90 12 0	1 14 0	1 6 3	1 0 10
16,510 0 0	26,610	62	10,578 1 0	2	478 1 0	1 13 5	1 2 7	0 13 3
94,463 0 0	1,50,859 1,45,650a	382	58,044 15 0	10	1,648 15 0	1 14 5	1 6 10	1 0 11
25,291 7 0	36,673	78	11,968 9 0	4	287 0 0	2 2 3	1 11 7	1 3 8
16,110 4 0	24,751	65	8,679 12 0	5	39 0 0	1 13 10	1 8 1	0 15 8
22,017 14 0	34,454	78	12,465 2 0	2	29 0 0	1 14 6	1 8 5	0 14 0
63,419 9 0	95,878 90,468a	221	32,813 7 0	11	355 0 0	1 15 8	1 9 5	1 0 3
35 082 6 0	47,434	118	22,446 4 0	3	94 10 0	2 8 4	1 13 1	1 1 5
24 644 10 0	40,800	69	16,332 15 0	4	177 9 0	2 4 4	1 11 0	1 1 5
33,057 7 3	53,171	116	20,613 15 9	7	500 7 0	2 4 4	1 14 1	1 5 19
20,695 14 6	36,463	58	15,930 15 6	7	163 14 0	2 0 0	1 10 3	1 2 0
17,044 12 6	26,234	63	9,301 6 6	4	112 3 0	2 5 2	1 0 5	0 14 6
30,106 11 0	44,005	104	14,051 9 0	7	153 4 0	2 5 6	1 13 1	1 8 5
1,60,631 13 3	2,58,107 2,34,185a	528	98,677 1 9	32	1,201 15 0	2 4 9	1 12 3	1 2 4
60,746 4 9	79,317	176	20,130 11 3	20	1,560 0 0	2 3 5	1 11 1	1 4 7
36,477 2 0	48,210	80	12,071 7 0	6	338 9 0	2 5 1	1 9 10	1 3 5
57,271 5 6	82,039	201	25,514 0 6	18	746 6 0	1 14 7	1 7 10	1 1 11
34,466 0 0	43,732	66	9,710 4 0	13	664 4 0	1 11 10	1 5 2	0 15 5
1,88,980 12 3	2,53,098 2,38,018a	523	67,426 6 9	57	3,309 3 0	2 0 6	1 8 7	1 2 5
27,990 1 4	34,488	41	7,226 10 3	6	728 12 0	2 12 4	2 2 5	1 9 9
28,227 4 9	37,585	46	9,809 14 3	6	452 3 0	2 2 3	1 7 9	1 1 8
56,217 6 6	72,073 65,972a	87	17,036 8 6	12	1,180 15 0	2 6 5	1 11 10	1 1 10

jama and those that are without the former jama,

*No. Vb.—General statement explanatory of the revised assessment, according to the original assessment circles—(continued).*

Name of pargana.	Number of circle.	Revised demand with cesses.	PARGANA RATES ON						Remarks.
			First class.		Second class.		Third class.		
			Irrigated.	Unirrigated.	Irrigated.	Unirrigated.	Irrigated.	Unirrigated.	
1		46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53
Haweli Oudh	I	4,415 0 0	14	4 6	8 6 7	4 3 6			
	II	5,300 0 0	7 9 10	4 11 2	2 0 11				
	III	5,265 0 0	6 13 7	4 3 7	1 13 7				
	IV	4,960 0 0	6 9 7	4 1 0	1 12 6				
		99,940 0 0	...	...	...				
		94,883 8 0a							
Mangalsi	I	1,16,310 0 0	6 11 7	4 0 5	1 12 6				
		1,03,981 3 0a							
Amsin	I	82,110 0 0	6 12 3	4 2 3	1 11 7				
	II	3,295 0 0	5 6 0	3 13 4	1 6 1				
		85,405 0 6	...	...	...				
		80,320 15 0							
Pachhimráth	I	28,225 0 0	7 7 4	4 2 5	2 1 1				
	II	1,49,185 0 0	6 9 7	3 14 0	1 14 0				
	III	44,470 0 0	6 1 7	3 11 10	1 11 2				
		2,21,880 0 0	...	...	...				
		2,04,814 15 6a							
Khandansa	I	81,255 0 0	6 2 3	3 6 11	1 12 1				
		76,033 0 0a							
Akbarpur	I	78,475 0 0	7 6 5	4 12 10	2 3 2				
	II	86,985 0 0	7 0 0	4 6 5	2 0 0				
	III	27,475 0 0	6 9 7	4 0 0	1 12 9				
		1,92,935 0 0	...	...	...				
		1,84,975 5 0a							
Majhaura	I	57,345 0 0	6 13 0	4 3 0	1 13 0				
		53,368 5 0a							
Tánda	I	48,108 0 0	6 9 6	4 0 0	1 13 1				
	II	10,582 0 0	6 0 0	3 9 7	1 9 1				
Manjha now assessed.	...	1,315 0 0	...	...	...				
		60,005 0 0	...	...	...				
		59,302 4 0a							

The figures marked "a" denote the present jama and those that are without the former jama.

*No. Vb.—General statement explanatory of the revised assessment, according to the original assessment circles—(concluded).*

Name of pargana.		Number of circle.	Revised demand with cesses.	PARGANA RATES ON						Remarks.
				First class.		Second class.		Third class.		
				Irrigated.	Unirrigated.	Irrigated.	Unirrigated.	Irrigated.	Unirrigated.	
1			46	47	48	49	50	51*	52	53
Birhar ...	I	59,700 0 0	6 9 7	4 6 5	2 8 5					
Manjha Khamlain and Arazi Dewara.	...	2,275 0 0	...	...	...					
	II	65,380 0 0	6 6 5	4 3 2	2 6 5					
	III	27,275 0 0	6 0 0	4 0 0	2 3 2					
		1,54,630 0 0	...	...	...					
		1,49,296 10 0a								
Surharpur ...	I	37,590 0 0	7 3 6	4 4 6	2 4 6					
	II	35,370 0 0	7 0 0	4 1 0	2 1 0					
	III	35,315 0 0	7 0 0	4 1 0	2 1 0					
		98,275 0 0	...	...	...					
		92,730 14 0a								
Aldemau ...	I	58,870 0 0	8 0 0	5 0 0	2 3 0					
	II	41,820 0 0	8 0 0	5 0 0	2 2 0					
	III	54,500 0 0	6 12 0	4 10 0	2 4 0					
	IV	37,375 0 0	6 12 8	4 6 0	2 0 0					
	V	26,890 0 0	7 9 0	4 3 0	2 4 0					
	VI	45,105 0 0	7 3 0	4 6 0	2 0 0					
		2,64,560 0 0	...	...	...					
		2,40,044 9 0a								
Sultanpur ...	I	31,300 0 0	6 15 2	4 0 9	1 12 9					
	II	49,415 0 0	6 9 7	3 12 9	1 11 2					
	III	84,090 0 0	6 8 9	3 11 7	1 10 4					
	IV	44,620 0 0	5 13 4	3 6 11	1 0 4					
		2,59,425 0 0	...	...	...					
		2,43,970 11 11a								
Isauli ...	I	35,350 0 0	8 3 7	4 9 12	2 5 7					
	II	38,525 0 0	6 9 5	3 15 2	1 12 0					
		73,875 0 0	...	...	...					
		67,620 2 0a								

The figures marked "a" denote the present jama and those that are without the former jama.

*No. Vc.—The following table exhibits the summary demand, the request for sanction, and certain statistics regarding the revision*

Name of pargana.	Number of villages and mahals in the pargana.		Summary settlement demand.			Regular settlement assessment first imposed.	Revised assessment now recommended.	Reduction of first regular assessment involved in the proposals now submitted.	
1	2	3	4			5	6	7	8
	Mahals.	Villages	Rs. a. p.			Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	
Haweli Oudh ...	57	184	74,673	3	0	97,504	92,571	4,933	5 6
Mangalsi ...	40	114	87,831	4	6	1,05,692	94,470	11,222	10-62
Amsin ...	26	180	50,417	15	6	78,013	73,633	4,410	5 65
Pahlmíráth ...	115	502	1,96,996	12	4	2,62,200	2,42,408	19,792	7-55
Khandáusa ...	106	128	50,785	0	0	86,438	80,543	5,889	6-81
Akbarpur ...	56	372	1,18,227	2	6	1,74,970	1,66,926	8,044	4-60
Majhaura ...	47	245	70,748	11	0	97,913	89,136	8,777	8-96
Tánda ...	60	215	60,344	0	0	84,633	81,986	2,647	3 13
Birhar ...	22	392	93,552	0	0	1,49,466	1,44,453	5,013	3-35
Surharpur ...	38	235	66,491	12	0	98,941	94,330	4,611	4-66
Total ...	567	2,567	8,70,097	12	10	12,35,809	11,60,462	75,338	6 10
<i>Parganas transferred to Sultanpur.</i>									
Aldemau ...	118	475	1,37,842	12	0	2,22,875	2,02,445	20,430	9-17
Sultanpur ...	103	460	1,44,392	14	3	1,91,613	1,82,180	9,433	4-92
Isauli ...	51	99	56,217	6	6	72,073	65,972	6,101	8-47
Total ...	272	1,034	3,38,453	0	9	4,86,561	4,50,597	35,964	7-39

*lar assessment originally imposed, the modified proposals now submitted which has been made of the original assessment.*

Enhancement of summary settlement demand involved in the proposals now submitted.		Number of objections preferred.		Number of mahals and villages affected by objections preferred.		Number of objections dismissed.		Number of mahals and villages to which the objections which were dismissed, referred.		Number of objections admitted.		Number of mahals and villages to which the objections which were admitted referred.	
9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19			
Rs.	a. p.		Mahals.	Villages.		Mahals.	Villages.		Mahals.	Villages.			
77,897 13 0	23-97	182	38	123	77	11	59	105	27	64			
6,638 11 6	7 56	127	30	102	46	9	34	81	21	68			
23,185 0 6	45-95	186	23	119	79	6	66	107	17	83			
45,411 3 8	23-5	578	90	418	201	12	165	377	78	253			
29,764 0 0	58-61	141	96	102	60	11	44	81	85	58			
48,698 13 6	41 19	278	45	212	123	7	98	155	38	114			
18,387 5 0	25-99	418	43	187	176	5	65	242	38	122			
21,642 0 0	35-86	142	42	112	81	19	68	61	23	44			
50,901 0 0	54-41	795	8	340	477	1	218	318	7	122			
27,838 4 0	41-87	224	30	151	107	2	64	117	28	87			
2,90,364 3 2	33-37	3,071	445	1,896	1,427	83	881	1,644	362	1,015			
64,602 4 0	46-87	587	108	362	133	4	75	454	104	287			
37,787 1 9	26-17	410	74	305	195	26	154	215	48	151			
9,754 9 6	17-35	167	39	82	38	9	29	69	30	53			
1,12,143 15 3	33-13	1,104	221	749	366	39	258	738	182	491			

No. Vc.—The following table exhibits the summary demand, the request for sanction, and certain statistics regarding the revision

Name of pargana.	Summary demand of the villages in respect of which objections were preferred (column 12.	Regular assessment first imposed on the villages referred to in column 12.	Revised assessment now recommended for the villages mentioned in column 12.	Reduction of first regular assessment of village mentioned in column 12, involved in proposals now submitted.		Enhancement of the summary settlement demand of the villages mentioned in column 12, involved in the proposals now submitted.	
1	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
	Rs. a. p.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.		Rs. a. p.	
Haweli Oudh,	57,117 11 0	77,614	72,681	4,933	6 36	15,563 5 0	27-25
Mangalsi ...	82 218 12 6	99,325	88,101	11,222	11 30	5,882 3 6	7-15
Amsin ...	39,463 15 6	64,048	59,638	4,410	6-88	20,174 0 6	51-12
Pachhimráth,	1,68,216 0 4	2,27,137	2,07,345	19,792	8-71	39,128 15 8	23-26
Khandáusa...	39,627 0 0	71,448	65 559	5,859	8 24	25,932 0 0	36 29
Akberpur ...	66,503 12 0	1,02,978	94,934	8,044	7-81	28,430 4 0	42-74
Majbaura ...	56,891 13 0	80,071	71,294	8,777	10-96	14,399 3 0	25-31
Tánda ...	36,953 0 0	53,939	51,292	2,647	4 91	14,334 0 0	38-78
Birhar ...	81,593 0 0	1,33,934	1,28,921	5,013	3-74	47,328 0 0	58-
Surharpur ...	40,398 7 3	61,312	56,701	4,611	7-52	16,302 8 9	40-36
Total ...	6,68,991 7 7	9,71,804	8,96,466	75 338	7-75	2,27,474 8 5	34-
<i>Parganas transferred to Sultanpur.</i>							
Aldemau ...	1,01,867 2 6	1,73,479	13,049	20,430	11-78	51,181 13 6	50-24
Sultanpur ...	99,271 0 0	1,34,547	1,25,114	9,433	7-1	25,843 0 0	26-4
Isauli ...	48,703 14 0	64,111	58,010	6,101	9-52	9,306 2 0	19 10
Total ...	2,49,842 0 6	3,72,137	3,36,173	35,964	9-66	86,330 15 6	34-55

*lar assessment originally imposed, the modified proposals now submitted which has been made of the original assessment—(continued).*

Summary demand of the villages in which assessment modified in column 17.	Regular assessment first imposed on the villages mentioned in column 17.	Jama now proposed of the villages mentioned in column 17.	Reduction of first regular assessment of villages mentioned in column 19 involved in the proposal now submitted.		Enhancement of the summary settlement demand of villages mentioned in column 17, involved in proposals now modified.		Remarks.
27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34
Rs. a. p.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.		Rs. a. p.		
30,951 15 0	43,515	38,582	4 933	11 34	7,630 1 0	21 65	
57,500 0 0	71,407	60,185	11,222	15 72	2,685 0 0	4 67	
21,923 14 0	36,902	32,492	4,410	11 95	10,568 2 0	48 20	
99,367 2 6	1,45,737	1,25,945	19,792	13 58	26,577 12 6	26 75	
24,645 0 0	46,440	40,551	5,889	12 68	15,906 0 0	64 54	
31,447 0 0	51,794	43,750	8,044	15 53	12,303 0 0	39 12	
38,565 0 9	56,864	48,087	3,777	15 43	9,521 15 3	24 69	
1,26,908 0 0	20,790	18,143	2,647	12 73	5,452 8 0	42 97	
25,396 0 0	43,685	38,672	5,013	11 32	13,276 0 0	52 28	
19,231 6 0	33,063	28,452	4,611	13 95	9,220 10 0	47 95	
3,61,717 14 3	5,50,197	4,74,859	75,338	13 69	1,13,141 1 9	31 28	
78,802 12 0	1,38,690	1,18,260	20,430	15 2	39,457 4 0	50 45	
46,136 0 0	65,794	56,361	9,433	14 34	10,225 0 0	22 16	
34,074 2 0	47,580	41,479	6,101	12 32	7,404 14 0	21 73	
1,59,012 14 0	2,52,064	2,16,100	35,964	14 27	57,087 2 0	35 90	



## No. VI.—Statement of judicial work.

Nature of claim.	Number of claims.	CLAIMS DISPOSED OF										DISPOSED OF BY.				Remarks.
		By compromise or consent.	By default.	Ex-parte	Withdrawn.	On trial.			Grand total.	Settlement Officer.	Assistant Settlement Officer.	Extra Assistant Settlement Officer.	Sadr Munshiam.			
						Decreed.	Dismissed.	Total.								
I	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15		
I. Proprietary right ...	5,059	89	114	..	141	2,523	2,189	4,715	5,059	1,696	2,935	379	49			
II. 1. In taluka ...	6,237	1,171	297	..	371	907	8,491	4,398	6,237	3,147	2,315	567	178			
2. In other mahals ...	136	9	6	..	2	46	73	119	136	28	84	15	9			
III. Shares ..	13,614	3,219	373	..	745	3,320	5,357	8,677	13,614	365	400	8,373	3,976			
IV. 1. In taluka ...	6,731	819	364	..	286	2,707	2,555	5,262	6,731	202	778	4,045	1,706			
(a.) Sir or Dehdari, ...	1,323	441	69	..	33	402	378	780	1,323	33	23	1,039	228			
(b.) Shankalp ...	3,040	727	171	..	75	953	1,109	2,067	3,040	28	78	2,453	481			
(c.) Birt ...	21,195	7,214	1,086	..	829	6,265	5,771	12,036	21,195	1,483	742	12,797	6,173			
(d.) All others ...	14,393	5,155	979	..	585	4,060	3,614	7,674	14,393	403	719	8,526	4,745			
2. In other mahals ...																
Total	71,728	18,874	4,059	..	3,067	21,191	24,537	45,723	71,723	7,385	8,104	38,694	17,545			

## No. VII.—Return illustrating the Ownership and Rental of Talukas.

Name of taluka.	Name of talukdars.	Area in acres.	Gross rental of taluka.		Government demand.	Profits of						Remarks.
			Of Sub-proprietors.	Total.		Of talukdars.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9				
PRESENT FYZABAD DISTRICT.												
Aghial	Chaudhari Ghulam Farid ...	3,502	Rs. a. p. 8,703 15 2	Rs. a. p. 4,351 15 7	Rs. a. p. 3,319 11 6	Rs. a. p. 1,032 4 1	Rs. a. p. 4,351 15 7	Rs. a. p. 4,351 15 7				
Birbar	Babu Hardatt Singh ...	39,927	83,993 1 5	41,999 0 8	29,625 6 10	12,373 9 10	41,999 0 8	41,999 0 8				
Do.	" Kishn Parshad ...	39,738	82,931 1 5	41,165 8 8	29,889 12 1	20,275 12 7	41,165 8 8	41,165 8 8				
Do.	" Shupregash ...	36,070	74,743 7 11	37,371 11 11	21,109 15 10	16,261 12 1	37,371 11 11	37,371 11 11				
Do.	" Mahiparain ...	33,469	69,041 5 0	34,520 10 6	18,147 2 6	16,373 7 11	34,520 10 6	34,520 10 6				
Bhiti	" Jaidatt Singh ...	31,856	73,689 7 2	36,844 11 7	21,202 6 1	15,642 5 6	36,844 11 7	36,844 11 7				
Paliapartab in	Raja Muhammad Ali ...	1,560	3,219 8 0	1,609 12 0	734 3 11	875 8 1	1,609 12 0	1,609 12 0				
Hesampur.	Mir Bakar and Ghazafar Husain.	90,999	1,88,259 14 0	94,129 15 0	85,198 5 10	8,931 9 2	94,129 15 0	94,129 15 0				
Pirpur	Babu Firtulpal ...	7,162	16,696 14 0	8,348 7 0	5,536 1 0	2,762 6 0	8,348 7 0	8,348 7 0				
Tighra	Rani Shiraj Kuar ...	2,235	4,041 0 0	2,020 8 0	1,629 4 4	391 3 8	2,020 8 0	2,020 8 0				
Damodara	Raja Shankari Bakhsh ...	36,115	92,697 5 0	46,348 10 8	30,205 2 10	16,143 7 9	46,348 10 8	46,348 10 8				
Dera	" Azam Ali ...	7,407	17,162 6 4	8,581 3 2	7,779 2 2	802 1 0	8,581 3 2	8,581 3 2				
Deogaon	Babu Hardatt Singh ...	10,715	23,979 5 0	11,989 10 6	10,244 12 5	1,744 14 1	11,989 10 6	11,989 10 6				
Samarpur	Munshi Hidayat Husain ...	82,224	1,81,893 15 0	90,914 7 6	76,847 2 3	14,067 5 3	90,914 7 6	90,914 7 6				
Samarpur	Thakurain Reghonath Kuar,	36,897	87,853 7 0	43,926 11 6	31,997 5 9	11,929 5 9	43,926 11 6	43,926 11 6				
Sikpur	Mir Asraf Husain ...	3,869	9,426 4 0	4,713 2 0	2,859 4 8	1,553 13 4	4,713 2 0	4,713 2 0				
Kataria	Rani Kishnath Kuar ...	20,823	47,991 12 0	23,995 14 0	13,131 3 4	10,864 10 8	23,995 14 0	23,995 14 0				
Korwar	Babu Ram Sarup ...	28,600	64,254 1 0	32,127 0 6	13,219 0 9	18,907 15 9	32,127 0 6	32,127 0 6				
Khapradih	" Abaldatt ...	20,080	45,158 11 10	22,579 5 11	16,323 2 1	6,255 10 7	22,579 5 11	22,579 5 11				
Khajurbat	" Jahangir Bakhsh ...	3,151	6,761 4 0	3,375 10 0	2,412 2 1	963 7 11	3,375 10 0	3,375 10 0				
Gaungeo	" Jahangir Bakhsh ...	2,385	6,722 0 0	3,361 0 0	2,439 1 5	921 14 7	3,361 0 0	3,361 0 0				
Maniarpur	Ilahi Khanam ...	2,385	6,722 0 0	3,361 0 0	2,439 1 5	921 14 7	3,361 0 0	3,361 0 0				

No. VII.—Return illustrating the Ownership and Rental of Talukas—(concluded).

Name of taluka.	Name of talukdars.	Area in acres.	Gross rental of taluka.	Government demand.	Profits of			Remarks.
					Of talukdars.	Of Sub-proprietors.	Total.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
			Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.	
Mondera ...	Gayadin Singh	7,563	15,307 0 0	7,653 8 0	7,085 8 8	567 15 4	7,653 8 0	
Meopur Dhauroa, ...	Babu Udres and Chandres,	30,321	67,048 15 0	33,524 7 6	25,067 13 8	8,456 9 10	38,524 7 6	
Meopur Baragaon, ...	" Amres Singh	22,141	49,414 12 0	24,707 6 0	19,688 11 10	5,013 10 2	24,707 6 0	
Meopur Dahla ...	" Ishraj Singh	3,073	6,443 6 0	3,221 11 0	2,302 3 6	919 7 6	3,221 11 0	
Meopur Dahla ...	" Lallu Sah	1,632	3,900 0 0	1,950 0 0	1,722 8 0	237 8 0	1,950 0 0	
Meopur Dahla ...	Babu Ishraj Singh and Lallu Sah.	313	772 10 0	386 5 0	237 8 8	98 12 4	386 5 0	
Shirakati.	Maharaj Subhao Kuar	190,204	4,03,841 14 0	2,48,420 15 0	1,95,212 2 11	53,208 12 1	2,48,420 15 0	
Mahdona ...	Babu Sitla Bakhsh	8,433	16,264 8 0	8,132 4 0	6,645 2 0	1,487 2 0	8,132 4 0	
Nane Mao ...								
	Total	302,500	18,44,543 2 7	9,22,271 9 3	6,72,912 2 3	2,48,359 7 0	9,22,271 9 3	
PARAGANAS TRANSFERRED TO THE SULTANPUR DISTRICT.								
Bhadaiyan Fazilpur.	Babu Bishnath Singh, & Co.,	1,871	4,112 12 2	2,056 6 1	1,623 4 6	433 1 7	2,056 6 1	
Firpur ...	Mir Bakar Husain and Ghazafar Husain.	931	1,902 8 0	951 4 0	612 7 0	38 13 0	951 4 0	
Jaisinghpur ...	Raja Muhammad Ali	16,305	39,094 0 0	19,547 0 0	12,938 10 11	6,613 5 1	19,547 0 0	
Damodara ...	Rani Shikraj Kuar	4,709	9,258 8 0	4,629 4 0	4,171 5 0	457 15 0	4,629 4 0	
Dera ...	Raja Shankari Bakhsh	38,070	81,309 4 0	42,154 10 0	32,914 6 0	9,240 4 0	42,154 10 0	
Samrathpur ...	Babu Hardatt Singa	9,798	24,921 6 0	12,460 11 0	11,751 3 5	709 7 7	12,460 11 0	

	6,879	16,544	4	4	8,272	2	2	4,856	2	2	3,016	0	0	8,272	2	2
Thakurain Raghunath Kuar ...	6,879	16,544	4	4	8,272	2	2	4,856	2	2	3,016	0	0	8,272	2	2
Raul Kishan Kuar ...	16,977	40,003	4	0	20,001	2	0	15,272	6	11	4,728	11	1	20,001	2	0
Babu Hansarp Singh ...	14,864	34,672	8	10	17,886	4	5	5,877	13	6	11,498	6	11	17,886	4	5
Khapradhi ...	6,835	15,331	10	0	7,665	13	0	5,748	4	8	1,917	8	4	7,665	13	0
Gango ...	10,825	22,533	0	0	11,426	8	0	8,359	1	11	3,097	6	1	11,426	8	0
Jlahi Khanam ...	16,849	41,763	14	0	20,832	15	0	18,773	13	2	2,109	1	10	20,832	15	0
Maharaja Sobhao Kuar ...	30,427	55,830	6	0	27,915	3	0	22,332	10	10	5,592	8	2	27,915	3	0
Babu Uddes and Chandres,	10,957	23,609	6	0	11,804	11	0	9,206	6	1	2,598	4	11	11,804	11	0
" Amtes Singh ...	10,721	23,578	11	6	11,289	15	9	8,982	11	2	1,396	10	7	11,289	15	9
" Ishraj Sahi ...	7,349	15,291	10	0	7,635	13	0	6,076	12	0	1,575	1	0	7,635	13	0
Lallu Sani ...	6,139	15,259	2	0	7,197	9	3	6,186	8	3	1,793	0	9	7,197	9	0
Ishraj and Lallu Sah,	6,998	15,197	10	0	7,598	13	0	4,394	14	4	3,203	14	8	7,598	13	0
Sitla Bakhsh ...																
Total ...	2,15451	4,83,234	12	10	2,41,617	6	5	1,80,757	13	10	60,859	8	61	2,41,617	4	5

*No. VIIa. — List showing name, caste, and residence of Talukdars, and the name given to their estates in different parganas in the settlement records.*

Serial number.	Name of taluka.	Name of talukdar.	Caste of talukdar.	Residence of talukdar.	Name of pargana in which property lies.	Name of mauza by which taluka known in the Pargana.
1	Aghiari ...	Ghulam Farid, Mahbub-urrahman, Khablutrahman.	Sheikh ...	Rudauli, Bara Banki district.	Khandānsa ...	Aghiari.
2	Birhar ...	Hardat Singh,	Palwár ...	Haswar, pargana, Birhar.	Birhar Akbarpur Tānda Surharpur ...	Birhar. Ramnagar. Sadrpu. Birhar.
3	Ditto ...	Kishu Parsad.	Ditto ...	Sultanpur, pargana Birhar.	Birhar Akbarpur Tānda Surharpur ...	Birhar. Ramnagar. Ismailpur. Birhar.
4	Ditto ...	Shimpargash,	Ditto ...	Ramdih Sarai urf Garha Birhar.	Birhar Tānda Surharpur ...	Birhar. Katahu. Birhar.
5	Ditto ...	Mahipnarain,	Ditto ...	Lakhanpur, pargana Birhar.	Birhar Surharpur ...	Birhar. Birhar.
6	Bhiti, Jaidat Singh	Jaidat Singh,	Bachgoti ...	Bhiti, pargana Majhaura.	Majhaura Havch Oudh Amsin Pachimrāth Tānda ...	Bhiti. Ditto. Ditto. Beni Gadepur. Bhoalpur.
7	Pirpur ...	Bakar Hussain, and Ghazafar Hussain.	Saiyad ...	Aurangabad, pargana Akbarpur.	Akbarpur Amsin Majhaura Tānda Birhar ...	Pirpur. Pirpur. Pirpur. Barahimpur. Kusmah. Oril.
8	Tighra ...	Babu Pirthipal Singh.	Palwár ...	Tighra, pargana Surharpur.	Surharpur Ditto ...	Pirpur. Tighra.

*No. VIIa.—List showing name, caste, and residence of Talukdars, and the name given to their estates in different parganas in the settlement records—(continued.)*

Serial number.	Name of taluka.	Name of talukdar.	Caste of talukdar.	Residence of talukdar.	Name of pargana in which property lies.	Name of mauza by which taluka known in the pargana.
9	Hasanpur,	Raja Mahmud Ali Khan.	Khanzada,	Hasanpur, pargana and zila Sultanpur.	Pachhimráth ...	Hasanpur.
10	Damodra...	Muní Shiuraj Kuar, widow of Rao Baryar Singh.	Rajkumar,	Dera, pargana Aldemau, zila Sultanpur.	Amsin ... Pachhimráth ... Majhaura ..	Hirdepur. Bhopa Duhia. Sultanpur.
11	Dera ...	Raja Shahan kari Bakhsh Singh.	Rajkumar,	Dera, pargana Aldemau zila Sultanpur.	Haweli Oudh .. Amsin ... Akbarpur ... Majhaura ... Tanda ... Surharpur ...	Mau Jadbanspur. Dera. Ditto. Ditto. Aurangabad. Dera.
12	Deogaon ...	Azam Ali Khan.	Khanzada.	Deogaon, pargana Khandansa.	Khandansa ...	Deogaon.
13	Samrathpur.	Babu Hardat Singh.	Bachgoti ...	Samrathpur, pargana Pachhimráth.	Pachhimráth ..	Samrathpur.
14	Samanpur,	Munshi Hidayat Husain.	Sayyad ...	Lorpur, pargana Akbarpur.	Akbarpur ... Amsin ... Majhaura ... Tanda ... Birhar ... Surharpur ...	Samanpur. Ditto. Ditto. Asopur. Samanpur. Samanpur.
15	Sihipur ...	Thakurain Raghunath Kuar, widow of Nihal Singh.	Garagbansi,	Sihipur, pargana Pachhimráth.	Pachhimráth ... Haweli Oudh ... Amsin ... Majhaura ...	Sihipur. Ditto Ditto Ditto
16	Katariya ...	Mir Karamat Husain.	Saiyad ...	Katariya, pargana Akbarpur.	Akbarpur ... Tanda.	Katariya. Behrozpur.

*No. VIIa.—List showing name, caste, and residence of Talukdars, and the names given to their estates in different parganas in the settlement records—(continued).*

Serial number.	Name of taluka.	Name of talukdar.	Caste of talukdar.	Residence of talukdar.	Name of pargana in which property lies.	Name of mauza by which taluka known in the pargana.
71	Kurwar ...	Rani Kish-nath Kuar, widow of Raja Madhohar Singh.	Bachgoti ...	Kurwar, zila Sultanpur.	Amsin ... Pachhimráth ... Majhaura ...	Kurwar. Bathgaon. Ditto
18	Khapradih,	Babu Ram Sarup Singh.	Garagbansi,	Khapradih, pargana Pachhimráth.	Pachhimráth ... Amsin ... Akbarpur ... Majhaura ... Surharpur ...	Khapradih. Ditto Ditto Ditto Ditto
19	Khajrahat,	Babu Abhai-datt Singh.	Bachhgoti,	Khajrahat, pargana Pachhimráth.	Pachhimráth ... Haweli Oudh ... Amsin ... Majhaura ... Tanda ...	Khajrahat. Ditto Ditto Ditto Maheripur.
20	Gangeo ...	Babu Jahan-gir Bakhsh Khan.	Khanzada,	Gangeo, zila Sul-tanpur.	Amsin ... Majhaura ...	Samdha. Gangeo.
21	Manyarpur.	Ilahi Khanam, widow of Akbar Ali Khan.	Ditto ...	Pali, zila Sul-tanpur.	Pachhimráth ...	Maniarpur.
22	Mundehra,	Babu Gayadin Singh.	Palwár ...	Mundehra ...	Surharpur ...	Mundehra.
23	Meopur ... Dhaurua ...	Babu Udres Singh and Chandres Singh.	Rajkomar,	Dhaurua, pargana, Akbarpur,	Akbarpur ... Amsin ... Manjhaura ... Tanda ... Bilhar ... Surharpur ...	Meopur Dhaurua. Ditto Ditto Tilokpur. Meopur Dhaurua. Ditto
24	Meopur Baragaon.	Babu Amres Singh.	Rajkumar,	Baragaon, pargana Surharpur.	Akbarpur ... Majhaura ... Surharpur ...	Meopur Baragaon. Ditto. Ditto.

*No. VIIa.—List showing name, caste, and residence of Talukdars, and the names given to their estates in different parganas in the settlement records—(concluded).*

Serial number.	Name of taluka.	Name of talukdar.	Caste of talukdar	Residence of talukdar.	Name of pargana in which property lies.	Name of mauza by which taluka known in the pargana.
25	Meo pur Dahla.	Babu Ishraj Singh.	Ditto ...	Gangapur, pargana Aldemau.	Akbarpur ...	Meo pur Dahla.
26	Ditto ...	Babu Lallú Sah.	Ditto ...	Kumhi pargana Aldemau.	Ditto , ...	Ditto.
27	Ditto ...	Babu Ishraj Singh and Lallú Sah.	Ditto ...	Gangapur and Kumhi.	Ditto ...	Ditto.
28	Mehdona ..	Mus a m m a t Subhao Kunwar, widow of Maharaja Man Singh, Sir Bahadur.	B r a h m i n Shakaldi-pi.	Shahganj, pargana Puchhimráth.	Pachhimráth ... Haweli Oudh .. Mangalsi ... Amsin ... Khaudansa ... Majhaura. ...	Mehndona. Ditto. Ditto. Ditto. Bhakanli. Mehndona.
29	Nanimau,	Babu Sitla B a k h s h Singh.	Rajkomar,	Isapur, pargan: Anguli, zila Jaunpur.	Akbarpur ...  Majhaura ...	Nanamau.  Ditto.



## No. VIII.—Return of

Name of tahsil.	Name of pargana.	Number of villages.		Number of square miles.	Number of hamlets.	Number of houses.	Number of souls.	
1	2	3		4	5	6	7	
FYZABAD.								
Fyzabad	...	Haweli Oudh ...	184	185	127	712	28,163	1,32,577
		Mangalsi ...	114	114	116	428	16,132	92,855
		Amsin ...	180	193	99	653	9,821	59,761
		Total ...	478	492	342	1,793	54,116	2,85,193
Bikapur	...	Pachhimrāth ...	502	503	349	2,205	37,812	2,10,860
		Khandāusa ...	128	128	117	390	12,136	73,789
		Total ...	630	631	466	2,595	49,948	2,84,649
Akbarpur	...	Akbarpur ...	372	399	263	1,132	23,342	1,36,155
		Majhaura ...	245	266	129	650	15,898	74,352
		Total ...	617	665	392	1,782	39,240	2,10,507
Tānda	...	Tānda ...	215	279	124	606	14,225	78,143
		Birhar ...	392	520	221	1,038	18,916	1,19,903
		Surharpur ...	235	238	144	724	13,528	85,425
		Total ...	842	1,037	489	2,368	46,669	2,83,471
Grand total ...		2,567	2,825	1,689	8,538	1,89,973	10,63,820	
PARGANAS TRANS.								
Kādipur	...	Aldemau ...	475	508	309	1,497	35,082	1,63,365
Sultanpur	...	Sultanpur Ba- raunsa.	460	460	259	1,292	26,673	1,55,764
Musáfirkhana	...	Isauli ...	99	99	87	327	9,785	55,300
Total ...		1,034	1,067	655	3,116	71,540	3,74,429	
Total of both districts.		3,601	3,892	2,344	11,654	2,61,513	14,38,249	

## Rural Police.

## DETAIL OF

Number of chauldars.	MEN.			REMUNERATION.					Remarks.
	Number of houses to each chauldard.	Number of souls to each chauldard.	Area to each chauldard.	Amount of land.	Net produce thereof.	Amount in cash.	Total of two last heads.	Average monthly income of each chauldard.	
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
185	185	717	438-91	655.	3,372 6 11	36 0 0	3,408 6 11	1 9 0	
108	145	860	689-64	422	2,388 3 3	146 0 0	2,534 3 3	1 15 3	
161	61	371	392-24	628	3,415 7 0	...	3,415 7 0	1 12 3	
454	129	628	482-	1,705	9,176 1 2	182 0 0	9,358 1 2	1 11 6	
422	90	500	529-96	1,616	10,076 10 0	546 3 11	12,620 13 11	2 1 7	
170	71	434	440-11	141	1,224 0 0	2,856 0 0	4,080 0 0	2 0 0	
592	84	481	504-16	1,757	11,300 10 0	3,402 3 11	14,702 13 11	2 1 1	
329	71	414	511-21	1,148	7,372 0 0	378 0 0	7,750 0 0	1 15 5	
169	94	440	488-69	642	3,402 14 0	552 0 0	3,954 14 0	1 15 2	
498	79	423	503-57	1,790	10,774 14 0	930 0 0	11,704 14 0	1 15 4	
150	95	521	528-49	710	3,424 7 9	6 4 0	3,430 11 9	1 14 6	
262	72	453	539-61	1,192	3,308 9 9	308 11 3	3,617 5 0	1 2 5	
181	75	472	509-70	619	3,948 2 6	969 8 0	4,217 10 6	1 15 1	
593	79	478	527-67	2,521	10,681 4 0	584 7 3	11,265 11 3	1 9 4	
2,137	90	498	505-84	7,773	41,932 13 2	5,098 11 2	47,031 8 4	1 13 4	
FERRIED TO SULTANPUR.									
377	93	431	524-10	...	...	9,677 2 3	9,677 2 3	2 2 2	
416	64	374	398-58	230	446 6 4	7,237 12 11	7,684 3 3	1 8 8	
131	75	422	423-95	15	38 15 6	2,400 13 0	2,439 12 6	1 8 10	
924	77	405	453-39	245	485 5 10	19,315 12 2	19,801 2 0	1 12 7	
3,061	86	470	490-1	8,018	42,418 3 0	24,414 7 5	66,832 10 4	1 13 1	

*No. IX.—Cultivated area (in acres) and rental.*

Pargana.	Description of soil.	RENT PER ACRE.		Total area in acres.	Rental.	Government demand.						
		Irriga- ted.	Unir- rigated									
		No separate rates.										
FYZABAD DISTRICT.												
		Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.		
Haweli Oudh ...	Jamai ...	7	0	4	30,161	39	2,11,758	1	5	...		
	Kauli ...	4	5	3	9,903	74	45,264	9	11	...		
	Farda ...	1	14	4	4,951	87	9,262	14	8	...		
Total ...	...	...	...	...	45,017	...	266,885	10	0	94,883	0	0
Mangalsi ...	Jamai ...	6	11	7	30,684	72	2,06,322	10	9	...		
	Kauli ...	4	0	5	10,228	24	41,179	5	1	...		
	Farda ...	1	12	6	5,579	04	9,937	10	7	...		
Total ...	...	...	...	...	46,492	...	2,57,439	10	5	96,831	8	0
Amsin ...	Jamai ...	6	1	2	25,119	99	1,52,551	3	9	...		
	Kauli ...	3	15	9	9,968	25	39,632	3	11	...		
	Farda ...	1	8	10	4,784	76	7,426	5	6	...		
Total ...	...	...	...	...	39,873	...	1,99,670	3	2	75,478	15	0
Pachhimrath ...	Jamai ...	6	11	6	73,154	24	4,91,505	0	9	...		
	Kauli ...	3	14	9	47,928	64	1,87,971	2	1	...		
	Farda ...	1	14	1	5,045	12	9,485	13	7	...		
Total ...	...	...	...	...	1,26,128	...	6,88,962	0	5	2,48,460	9	6
Khandansa ...	Jamai ...	6	2	3	28,976	55	1,77,934	2	0	...		
	Kauli ...	3	6	11	8,818	95	30,267	15	3	...		
	Farda ...	1	12	11	4,199	50	7,589	11	6	...		
Total ...	...	...	...	...	41,995	...	2,15,791	12	9	82,563	0	0
Akbarpur ...	Jamai ...	7	0	0	37,220	40	2,60,542	12	9	...		
	Kauli ...	4	6	5	32,257	68	1,41,977	6	3	...		
	Farda ...	2	0	0	13,233	92	26,467	13	5	...		
Total ...	...	...	...	...	82,712	...	4,28,988	0	5	1,71,105	11	0
Majhaura ...	Jamai ...	6	13	0	34,539	84	2,35,302	10	0	...		
	Kauli ...	4	3	0	11,033	56	46,203	0	0	...		
	Farda ...	1	13	0	2,398	60	4,347	7	4	...		
Total ...	...	...	...	...	47,972	...	2,85,853	1	4	91,364	7	6
Tanda ...	Jamai ...	6	4	9	19,278	20	1,21,392	6	7	...		
	Kauli ...	3	12	9	16,457	...	62,485	2	9	...		
	Farda ...	1	11	4	11,284	80	19,278	3	0	...		
Total ...	...	...	...	...	47,020	...	2,03,155	12	4	84,031	0	0

## No. IX.—Cultivated area (in acres) and rental.

Pargana.	Description of soil.	RENT PER ACRE.		Total area in acres.	Rental.	Government demand.		
		Irriga- ted.	Unir- rigated					
		No separate rates.						
FYZABAD DISTRICT—(concluded).								
		Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.	
Birhar ...	Jamai ...	6	5	4	40,782 04	2,58,286	4	1
	Kauli ...	4	3	2	29,80 26	1,25,107	6	5
	Farda ...	2	6	0	7,842 70	18,626	6	7
Total ...		...			78,427	4, 2,020	1	1
Surharpur ...	Jamai ...	7	1	6	25,489 74	2,02,544	3	11
	Kauli ...	4	2	9	13,994 96	58,385	3	6
	Farda ...	2	2	9	7,497 30	16,283	3	2
Total ...		...			49,982	2,77,212	10	7
Total of present district.	Jamai ...	...	...	...	3,51,258 44	...	...	...
	Kauli ...	...	...	...	1,87, 41 58	...	...	...
	Farda ...	...	...	...	66,617 98	...	...	...
Total ...		...			6,05,618	32,25,978	14	4
TRANSFERRED TO SULTANPUR.								
Aldemau ...	Jamai ...	7	6	0	51,572 04	2,80,343	12	8
	Kauli ...	4	9	6	29,753 10	1,36,678	4	10
	Farda ...	2	2	2	17,851 86	38,121	2	7
Total ...		...			99,177	5,55,143	4	1
Sultanpur ...	Jamai ...	6	7	9	65,177	4,22,632	1	9
	Kauli ...	3	12	0	15,828 70	59,295	2	0
	Farda ...	1	8	8	12,104 30	18,660	12	6
Total ...		...			93,110	5,00,588	0	5
Isauli ...	Jamai ...	7	6	6	19,828 38	1,46,853	11	10
	Kauli ...	4	4	2	5,908 60	25,599	2	2
	Farda ...	2	0	9	4,206 02	8,609	3	1
Total ...		...			30,043	1,81,062	1	1
Total of trans- ferred par- gana.	Jamai ...	...	...	...	1,35,621 30	...	...	...
	Kauli ...	...	...	...	51,135 90	...	...	...
	Farda ...	...	...	...	35,572 80	...	...	...
Total ...		...			2,22,330	12,36,793	5	7
Grand total ...	Jamai ...	...	...	...	4,88,489 32	...	...	...
	Kauli ...	...	...	...	2,40,104 92	...	...	...
	Farda ...	...	...	...	99,353 76	...	...	...
Total ...		...			8,27,948	44,62,772	3	11

## No. X.-- Crop, amount and value of produce, (Circular 51 of 1870.)

Name of pargana.	Name of crop.	Area under crop in acres.	Amount of produce in maunds of 80 lbs. each.	Price per rupee.		Value of outturn in rupees at harvest price	Remarks.
				Harvest.	Average per year.		
Haweli Oudh			M. s. c.	M. s. c.	M. s. c.	Rs.	
	Wheat ...	8,817	1,17,266	0 25 8	0 20 0	1,839.47	
	Barley ...	2,628	27,725	0 38 0	0 30 0	29,185	
	Wheat and barley,	410	4,889	0 31 12	0 24 0	6,160	
	Pea ...	4,978	52,518	1 2 0	0 32 0	50,017	
	Barley and pea ...	325	3,430	1 2 8	0 32 0	3,266	
	Gram ...	2,748	26,999	0 33 0	0 28 0	32,726	
	Mustard ...	83	100	0 16 0	0 12 0	250	
	Linseed ...	199	189	0 18 0	0 14 0	420	
	Ajhar ...	4,957	26,272	0 32 8	0 30 0	32,335	
	Masur ...	44	50	0 26 0	0 20 0	77	
	Palihar ...	714	7,533	0 38 0	0 30 0	7,929	
	Dān ...	3,639	38,573	1 3 8	0 35 0	35,470	
	Jahan ...	2,884	35,690	1 3 0	0 35 0	33,200	
	Urd ...	2,680	11,139	0 25 0	0 19 0	17,822	
	Mung ...	15	65	0 16 0	0 16 0	162	
	Mothi ...	1,029	7,100	0 31 0	0 24 0	9,161	
	Cotton ...	131	66	0 3 0	0 2 8	880	
	Kodon ...	814	3,521	1 10 0	1 0 0	2,817	
	Sawān ...	59	314	0 28 0	0 32 0	449	
	Juar kalan ...	2,205	25,413	0 35 0	0 24 0	29,043	
	Juar khurd ...	389	3,919	0 36 0	0 24 0	4,355	
	Petwa ...	3	6	0 16 0	0 10 0	15	
	Bājra ...	257	1,799	0 37 0	0 25 0	1,945	
	Shakarkand ...	1	30	1 0 0	0 1 0	30	
	Sami ...	5	10	0 10 0	0 8 0	40	
	Sugarcane ...	1,678	27,835	0 17 4	0 14 0	64,545	
	Poppy ...	511	102	0 0 4	0 0 1	16,320	
	Tobacco ...	60	1,260	(a) 1 20 0	(b) 0 4 0	840	(a) green.
	Kachiana ...	424	...	...	...	21,200	(b) dried.
	New fallow ...	3,714	...	...	...	...	@ 50 per acre.
	Total ...	46,401	...	...	...	5,84,606	

*Crop, amount and value of produce.*

Name of pargana.	Name of crop.	Area under crop in acres.	Amount of produce in maunds of 80 lbs. each.	Price per rupee.		Value of outturn in rupees at harvest price.	Remarks.
				Harvest.	Average per year.		
			Mds	M. s. c.	M. s. c.	Rs.	
MANGALGI.	Wheat ...	8,155	112,452	0 25 8	0 20 0	1,76,395	
	Barley ...	4,124	43,258	0 38 0	0 30 0	45,535	
	Wheat and barley,	1,089	12,986	0 31 12	0 24 0	16,361	
	Pea ...	6,650	70,158	1 2 0	0 32 0	66,817	
	Barley and pea ...	197	2,078	1 2 8	0 32 0	1,956	
	Gram ...	2,260	22,205	0 33 0	0 28 0	26,915	
	Mustard ...	52	62	0 16 0	0 12 0	155	
	Linseed ...	221	190	0 28 0	0 14 0	496	
	Arhar ...	5,478	29,033	0 32 5	0 30 0	35,733	
	Masūr ...	142	160	0 26 0	0 20 0	246	
	Palihar ...	39	411	0 38 0	0 30 0	433	
	Dhān ...	4,143	43,916	1 3 3	0 35 0	40,382	
	Jarhan ...	1,069	13,234	1 3 0	0 35 0	12,311	
	Urd ...	1,368	5,711	0 25 0	0 19 0	9,138	
	Mung ...	5	22	0 20 0	0 16 0	44	
	Mothi ...	432	2,981	0 31 0	0 24 0	3,846	
	Cotton ...	213	107	0 3 0	0 2 8	1,427	
	Kodon ...	290	1,254	1 10 0	1 0 0	1,003	
	Sawān ...	57	304	0 28 0	0 32 0	434	
	Juar kalan ...	1,080	12,447	0 35 0	0 21 0	14,225	
	Juar khurd ..	396	3,927	0 36 0	0 24 0	4,063	
	Bājra ..	252	1,764	0 37 0	0 25 0	1,907	
	Shakarkand ..	2	60	1 0 0	1 0 0	60	
	Sanai ...	2	4	0 10 0	0 8 0	16	
	Sugarcane ...	2,073	34,412	0 17 4	0 14 0	79,796	
	Poppy ...	517	103	0 0 4	0 0 1	16,180	
	Tobacco ...	58	1,218	(a) 1 20 0	(b) 0 4 0	812	(a) green.
	Kachiana. ...	238	...	...	...	11,900	(b) dried.
	New fallow ...	5,593	...	...	...	...	@ 50 per acre.
	Total ...	46,492	...	...	...	5,68,826	

*Crop, amount and value of produce.*

Name of pargana.	Name of crop.	Area under crop in acres.	Amount of produce in maunds of 80 lbs. each.	Price per rupee.		Value of outturn in rupees at harvest price.	Remarks.
				Harvest.	Average per year.		
			Mds.	M. s. c	M. s. c.	Rs.	
Amsin.	Wheat ...	9,255	1,23,091	0 25 8	0 20 0	1,93,084	
	Barley ...	2,959	20,392	0 38 0	0 30 0	21,466	
	Barley and wheat,	38	401	0 31 12	0 24 0	505	
	Pea ...	3,183	33,580	1 2 0	0 32 0	31,981	
	Barley and pea ...	6	63	1 2 8	0 32 0	59	
	Gram ...	1,336	13,116	0 33 0	0 28 0	15,898	
	Mustard ...	6	6	0 16 0	0 12 0	15	
	Linseed ...	683	598	0 18 0	0 14 0	1,328	
	Arhar ...	2,812	15,063	0 32 8	0 30 0	18,539	
	Masur ...	100	112	0 26 0	0 20 0	172	
	Palihar ...	14	118	0 38 6	0 30 0	156	
	Dhán ...	4,929	52,247	1 3 8	0 35 0	48,013	
	Jarhan ...	438	5,420	1 3 0	0 35 0	5,042	
	Urd ...	4,593	19,176	0 25 0	0 19 0	30,681	
	Mung ...	26	155	0 20 0	0 16 0	3,110	
	Mothi ...	1,314	9,067	0 31 0	0 24 0	11,699	
	Kodon ...	3,057	16,279	1 0 0	1 0 0	16,279	
	Mendua ...	117	623	1 0 0	0 32 0	623	
	Juar kalan ...	521	4,903	0 35 0	0 24 0	5,605	
	Juar khurd ...	71	682	0 36 0	0 24 0	758	
	Bájra ...	116	690	0 37 0	0 25 0	746	
	Sugarcane ...	2,227	36,968	0 17 4	0 14 0	85,723	
	Poppy ...	640	128	0 0 4	0 0 1	20,480	
	Tobacco ...	128	2,688	(a) 1 20 0	(b) 0 4 0	1,792	(a) green. (b) dried.
	Kachiana ...	171	...	...	...	8,550	@ 50 per acre.
	New fallow ...	1,363	...	...	...	...	
	Total ...	40,137	...	...	...	5,19,532	

*Crop, amount and value of produce.*

Name of pargana.	Name of crop.	Area under crop in acres.	Amount of produce in maunds of 80 lbs. each.	Price per rupee.		Value of outturn in rupees at harvest price.	Remarks.
				Harvest.	Average per year.		
Tābhīnāsth.			Mds.	M. s. c	M. s. c.	Rs.	
	Wheat ...	31,566	4,59,728	0 25 8	0 20 0	7,21,142	
	Barley ...	2,289	24,144	0 38 0	0 30 0	25,420	
	Wheat and barley.	218	2,600	0 31 12	0 24 0	3,275	
	Pea ...	13,533	1,42,773	1 2 0	0 32 0	1,35,974	
	Barley and pea.	167	1,762	1 2 8	0 32 0	1,659	
	Gram ...	7,403	72,715	0 33 0	0 28 0	88,139	
	Mustard ...	47	56	0 16 0	0 12 0	140	
	Linseed ...	1,406	1,230	0 18 0	0 14 0	2,734	
	Arhar ...	7,641	40,447	0 32 8	0 30 0	49,781	
	Masur ...	215	242	0 26 0	0 20 0	372	
	Palhar ...	48	506	0 38 0	0 30 0	533	
	Dhán ...	25,718	2,72,611	1 3 8	0 35 0	2,50,677	
	Jarlan ...	3,134	38,783	1 3 0	0 35 0	36,077	
	Urd ...	6,675	27,868	0 25 0	0 19 0	44,589	
	Mung ...	23	99	0 20 0	0 16 0	198	
	Mothi ...	500	3,450	0 31 0	0 24 0	4,451	
	Cotton ...	381	191	0 3 0	0 2 8	2,547	
	Kodon ...	1,975	8,542	1 10 0	1 0 0	6,834	
	Sawán ...	981	5,224	1 0 0	0 32 0	5,224	
	Juar kalan ...	903	10,407	0 35 0	0 24 0	11,894	
	Juár khurd,	424	4,272	0 36 0	0 24 0	4,747	
	Bajra ...	93	651	0 37 0	0 25 0	704	
	Sanai ...	1	2	0 10 0	0 8 0	8	
	Sugarcane ...	10,508	1,74,433	0 17 4	0 14 0	4,04,482	
	Poppy ...	1,204	241	0 0 4	0 0 1	38,560	
	Tobacco ...	57	1,197	(a) 1 20 0	(b) 0 4 0	793	(a) green. (b) dried.
	Kachiana ...	292	...	...	...	14,600	@ 50 per acre.
	New fallow,	5,915	...	...	...	...	
	Total ...	1,26,315	...	...	...	18,55,559	



*Crop, amount and value of produce.*

Name of pargana	Name of crop.	Area under crop in acres.	Amount of produce in maunds of 80lbs. each.	Price per rupee.		Value of outturn in rupees at har- vest price.	Remarks.
				Harvest.	Average per year.		
Khandānsa	Wheat ...	12,388	Mds. s. c. 1,64,760	Mds. s. c. 0 25 8	Mds. s. c. 5 20 0	Rs. 2,58,447	
	Barley ...	1,253	13,219	0 38 0	0 30 0	13,915	
	Barley and wheat,	268	3,077	0 31 12	0 24 0	3,876	
	Pea ...	5,877	62,002	0 38 0	0 32 0	65,265	
	Barley and pea ...	47	496	0 2 8	0 32 0	467	
	Gram ...	4,140	40,676	0 33 0	0 28 0	49,304	
	Mustard ...	2	2	0 16 0	0 12 0	5	
	Linseed ...	270	236	0 18 0	0 14 0	525	
	Arhar ...	4,608	24,173	0 32 8	0 30 0	29,751	
	Masūr ...	64	73	0 26 0	0 20 0	112	
	Dhān ...	5,251	55,651	1 3 8	0 35 0	51,182	
	Jarhan ...	140	1,733	1 3 0	0 35 0	1,612	
	Urd ...	2,049	8,535	0 25 0	0 19 0	13,688	
	Mung ...	1	4	0 20 0	0 16 0	8	
	Mothi ...	831	5,734	0 31 0	0 24 0	7,399	
	Cotton ...	51	26	0 3 0	0 2 8	347	
	Kodon ...	758	3,278	1 10 0	1 0 0	2,623	
	Mendua ...	105	559	1 0 0	0 32 0	559	
	Juar kalan ...	377	4,095	0 35 0	0 24 0	4,680	
	Juar khurd ...	229	2,307	0 36 0	0 24 0	2,564	
	Bājra ...	1	7	0 37 0	0 25 0	8	
	Shakarkand ...	6	180	1 0 0	1 0 0	180	
	Sugarcane ...	1,086	18,027	0 17 4	0 14 0	41,803	
	Poppy ...	501	100	0 0 4	0 0 1	16,000	
	Tobacco ...	8	168	(a) 1 20 0	(b) 0 4 0	112	(a) green. (b) dried.
	Kachiana ...	95	...	...	...	4,750	@50 per acre.
	New fallow ...	1,539	...	...	...	...	
	Total ...	41,945	...	...	...	5,69,182	

*Crop, amount and value of produce.*

Name of pargana.	Name of crop.	Area under crop in acres.	Amount of produce in maunds of 80 lbs. each.	Price per rupee.		Value of outturn in rupees at harvest price.	Remarks.
				Harvest.	Average per year.		
			M. s. c.	M. s. c.	M. s. c.	Rs.	
Akbarpur,	Wheat ...	8,242	109,619	0 25 0	0 20 0	1,71,951	
	Barley ...	1,145	116,525	0 38 0	0 30 0	1,22,658	
	Wheat and barley,	1,119	19,243	0 32 0	0 24 0	24,056	
	Pea ...	6,588	69,502	1 2 0	0 32 0	66,193	
	Barley and pea ...	1,294	13,652	1 2 8	0 32 0	12,849	
	Gram ...	7,112	69,875	0 33 0	0 28 0	84,697	
	Mustard ...	25	30	0 16 0	0 12 0	75	
	Linseed ...	2,226	1,918	0 18 0	0 14 0	4,329	
	Arhar ...	6,004	15,921	0 32 8	0 30 0	19,595	
	Masur ...	181	2,004	0 26 0	0 20 0	313	
	Palihar ...	806	8,503	0 38 0	0 30 0	8,951	
	Dhán ...	13,717	145,400	1 3 8	0 35 0	1,33,701	
	Jarhan ...	6,074	75,166	1 3 0	0 35 0	69,922	
	Urd ...	8,464	35,337	0 25 0	0 19 0	56,539	
	Mung ...	52	309	0 20 0	0 16 0	618	
	Mothi ...	692	4,775	0 31 0	0 24 0	6,161	
	Kodon ...	787	4,191	1 0 0	1 0 0	4,191	
	Mendua ...	74	394	1 0 0	0 32 0	394	
	Juar kalan ...	41	391	0 35 0	0 24 0	447	
	Juar khurd ...	196	1,402	0 36 0	0 24 0	1,558	
	Bájra ...	10	60	0 37 0	0 25 0	65	
	Patwa ...	18	9	0 16 0	0 10 0	23	
	Shakarkand ...	3	90	1 0 0	1 0 0	90	
	Sanai ...	3	6	0 10 0	0 8 0	24	
	Sugarcane ...	5,604	93,026	0 17 4	0 14 0	15,712	
	Poppy ...	368	74	0 0 4	0 0 1	11,840	(a) green.
	Tobacco ...	48	1,008	(a) 1 20 0	(b) 0 4 0	672	(b) dried.
	Cotton ...	3	2	0 3 0	0 8 8	26	
	Kachiana ...	75	...	...	...	3,750	@ 50 per acre.
	New fallow ...	1,309	...	...	...	...	
	Total ...	82,980	...	...	...	8,21,400	

*Crop, amount and value of produce.*

Name of pargana.	Name of crop.	Area under crop in acres.	Amount of pro- duce in maunds of 80 lbs each.	Price per rupee.		Value of outturn in rupees at har- vest price.	Remarks.
				Harvest.	Average per year.		
			Mds.	Mds. s. c	Mds. s. c	Rs.	
Majhara.	Wheat ...	8,139	118,189	0 25 8	0 20 0	186,492	
	Barley ...	4,815	51,853	0 38 0	0 30 0	54,582	
	Barley and wheat,	938	11,782	0 31 12	0 24 0	14,813	
	Pea ...	5,154	54,375	1 2 0	0 32 0	51,785	
	Barley and pea ...	69	727	1 2 8	0 32 0	684	
	Gram ...	4,158	40,852	0 33 0	0 28 0	49,518	
	Mustard ...	13	13	0 16 0	0 12 0	33	
	Linseed ...	591	517	0 18 0	0 14 0	1,149	
	Arhar ...	1,993	10,563	0 32 8	0 30 0	13,000	
	Masur ...	66	74	0 26 0	0 20 0	114	
	Palihar ...	126	1,329	0 38 0	0 20 0	1,399	
	Dhán ...	6,868	72,829	1 3 8	0 35 0	66,969	
	Jarhan ...	2,396	29,551	1 3 0	0 35 0	27,489	
	Urd ...	4,915	21,749	0 25 0	1 19 0	34,798	
	Mung ...	10	43	0 20 0	0 16 0	87	
	Mothi ...	799	5,513	0 31 0	1 24 0	7,114	
	Cotton ...	23	12	0 3 0	0 2 8	160	
	Kodon ...	875	3,783	1 10 0	1 0 0	3,027	
	Sawán ...	10	53	1 0 0	0 32 0	53	
	Juar kalan ...	37	426	0 35 0	0 24 0	457	
	Juar khurd ...	144	1,451	0 36 0	0 24 0	1,612	
	Patwa ...	1	16 seer.	0 14 0	0 10 0	1	
	Iája ...	4	1 — 28	0 37 0	0 25 0	30	
	Sugarcane ...	3,784	62,814	0 17 4	0 14 0	1,45,656	
	Poppy ...	276	55	0 0 4	0 0 1	8,768	(a) green.
	Tobacco ...	17	357	(a) 1 20 0	(b) 0 4 0	238	(b) dried.
	Kachiana ...	158	...	...	...	5,400	@ 50 per acre.
	New fallow ...	1,921	..	...	...	...	
	Total ...	48,400	...	...	...	6,75,488	

*Crop, amount and value of produce.*

Name of pargana.	Name of crop.	Area under crop in acres.	Amount of produce in 'maunds of 80 lbs. each.	Price per rupee.		Value of outturn in rupees at harvest price.	Remarks.
				Harvest.	Average per year.		
				Mds. s. c	Mds. s. c	Rs.	
Tānda.	Wheat ...	5 202	82,487	0 25 8	0 20 0	1,29,391	
	Barley ...	3,432	36,208	0 38 0	0 30 0	38,113	
	Barley and wheat,	1,093	13,034	0 31 12	0 24 0	16,421	
	Pea ...	3,134	33,059	1 2 8	0 32 0	31,114	
	Barley and pea ...	371	3,914	1 2 8	0 32 0	3,684	
	Gram ...	2,851	28,011	0 33 0	0 28 0	33,953	
	Mustard ...	27	32	0 16 0	0 12 0	80	
	Linseed ...	2,891	2,530	0 18 0	0 14 0	5,621	
	Arhar ...	3,561	18,873	0 32 8	0 30 0	23,229	
	Masur ...	208	234	0 26 0	0 20 3	360	
	Palihar ...	473	4,990	0 38 6	0 30 0	5,253	
	Dhān ...	8,616	91,330	1 3 8	0 35 0	83,981	
	Jarhan ...	2,059	25,481	1 3 0	0 35 0	23,704	
	Urd ...	5,308	22,161	0 25 0	0 19 0	35,457	
	Mung ...	139	558	0 20 0	0 16 0	1,116	
	Mothi ...	1,417	9,777	0 31 0	0 24 0	12,616	
	Kodon ...	821	3,563	1 10 0	1 0 0	2,850	
	Mendua ...	72	383	1 0 0	0 32 0	383	
	Juar kalan ...	67	772	0 35 0	0 24 0	882	
	Juar khurd ...	80	806	0 36 0	0 24 0	896	
	Bājra ...	6	42	0 37 0	0 25 0	45	
	Sugarcane ...	2,559	42,645	0 17 4	0 14 0	98,888	
	Poppy ...	433	87	0 0 4	0 0 1	13,920	
	Tobacco ...	44	921	(a) 1 20 0	(b) 0 4 0	616	(a) green. (b) dried.
	Cotton ...	78	40	0 3 0	0 2 8	533	
	Kachiana ...	52	...	...	...	2,600	@ 50 per acre.
	New fallow ...	998	...	...	...	...	
	Indigo ...	35	...	...	...	...	
	Total ...	47,031	...	...	...	5,65,706	

*Crops, amount and value of produce.*

Name of pargana.	Name of crop.	Area under crop in acres.	Amount of produce in maunds of 80lbs. each.	Price per rupee.		Value of outturn in rupees at harvest price.	Remarks.
				Harvest.	Average per year.		
				Mds. s. c.	Mds. s. c.	Rs.	
Birhar.	Wheat ...	8,468	110,338	0 25 8	0 20 0	1,73,080	
	Barley ...	13,128	138,479	0 38 0	0 30 0	1,45,768	
	Wheat and barley,	5,564	58,700	0 31 12	0 24 0	73,953	
	Pea ...	6,542	69,018	1 2 0	0 32 0	65,731	
	Barley and pea ...	594	6,267	1 2 8	0 32 0	5,898	
	Grau. ...	6,179	55,084	0 33 0	0 28 0	67,859	
	Mustard ...	125	150	0 16 0	0 12 0	375	
	Linseed ...	7,427	6,499	0 18 0	0 14 0	14,442	
	Arhar ...	5,353	28,371	0 32 8	0 30 0	34,918	
	Masur ...	74	83	0 26 0	0 20 0	128	
	Dián ...	7,769	82,101	1 3 8	0 30 0	75,725	
	Jarhan ...	3,633	44,953	1 3 0	0 35 0	41,821	
	Urd ...	2,117	8,838	0 25 0	0 19 0	14,141	
	Mung ...	13	77	0 20 0	0 16 0	154	
	Mothi ...	586	4,043	0 31 0	0 24 0	5,217	
	Cotton ...	18	9	0 3 0	0 2 8	120	
	Kodon ...	408	2,173	1 0 0	1 0 0	2,173	
	Mendua ...	2	11	1 0 0	0 32 0	11	
	Juar kalan ...	55	528	0 35 0	0 24 0	603	
	Juar khurd ...	25	240	0 36 0	0 24 0	267	
	Bájra ...	3	18	0 37 0	0 25 0	19	
	Patwa ...	29	15	0 16 0	0 10 0	38	
	Sugarcane ...	5,376	89,212	0 17 8	1 0 0	2,06,938	
	Poppy ...	672	134	0 0 8	0 0 1	21,440	
	Tobacco ...	102	54	(a) 1 20 0	(b) 0 4 0	36	(a) green.
	Kachiana ...	128	...	...	...	6,400	(b) dried.
	Indigo ...	125	...	...	...	...	@50 per acre.
	New fallow ...	3,912	...	...	...	...	
	Total ...	78,427	...	...	...	9,57,255	

*Crop, amount and value of produce.*

Name of pargana.	Name of crop.	Area under crops in acres.	Amount of pro- duce in maunds of 80 lbs. each.	Price per rupee.		Value of outturn in rupees at har- vest price.	Remarks.
				Harvest,	Average per year.		
				Mds. s. c.	Mds. s. c.	Rs.	
Surharpur.	Wheat ...	3,344	44,475	0 25 8	0 20 0	69,765	
	Barley ...	11,335	1,19,584	0 38 0	0 30 0	1,25,878	
	Wheat and barley,	1,603	19,115	0 31 12	0 24 0	24,082	
	Pea ...	4,363	46,030	1 2 0	0 32 0	43,838	
	Barley and pea...	347	3,660	1 2 8	0 32 0	3,445	
	Gram ...	3,007	38,386	0 33 0	0 28 0	46,529	
	Mustard ...	56	67	0 16 0	0 12 0	168	
	Linseed ...	2,534	2,217	0 18 0	0 14 0	4,927	
	Arhar ...	2,741	14,527	0 32 8	0 30 0	17,880	
	Masur ...	21	24	0 26 0	0 20 0	37	
	Palihar ...	778	8,208	0 38 0	0 30 0	8,640	
	Dhán and byás ...	6,241	66,155	1 3 8	0 35 0	60,832	
	Jarhan ...	3,090	38,230	1 3 0	0 35 0	35,563	
	Urd ...	3,764	15,715	0 25 0	0 19 0	25,144	
	Mung ...	8	35	0 20 0	0 16 0	70	
	Mothi ...	356	2,436	0 31 0	0 24 0	3,143	
	Cotton ...	2	1	0 3 0	0 2 8	13	
	Kodon ...	460	1,989	1 10 0	1 0 0	1,591	
	Mendua ...	34	181	1 0 0	0 32 0	181	
	Juar kalan ...	14	161	0 35 0	0 34 0	184	
	Juar khurd ...	72	725	0 36 0	0 24 0	806	
	Bájra ...	3	21	0 37 0	0 25 0	23	
	Sugarcane ...	3,254	54,016	0 17 4	0 14 0	1,25,255	
	Poppy ...	221	44	0 0 4	0 0 1	7,040	
	Tobacco ...	27	567	1 20 0	0 4 0	378	
	Kachiana ...	60	...	...	...	3,000	@ 50 per
	Indigo ...	75	...	...	...	...	acre.
	New fallow ...	1,336	...	...	...	...	
	Total ...	50,043	...	...	...	6,08,412	

*Crop, amount and value of produce.*

Name of pargana.	Name of crop.	Area under crop in acres.	Amount of produce in maunds of 80 lbs. each.	Price per rupee.		Value of outturn in rupees at harvest price.	Remarks.
				Harvest.	Average per year.		
				Mds. s. c.	Mds. s. c.	Rs.	
Aldemau.	Wheat ...	12,347	1,64,215	0 25 8	0 20 0	2,57,592	
	Barley ...	23,796	2,48,158	0 38 0	0 30 0	2,61,219	
	Barley and wheat,	1,294	15,331	0 31 12	0 24 0	19,315	
	Pea ...	13,505	1,42,478	1 2 0	0 32 0	1,35,695	
	Barley and pea ...	62	654	1 2 8	0 32 0	616	
	Gram ...	8,043	79,022	0 33 0	0 28 0	95,785	
	Mustard ...	11	11	0 16 0	0 12 0	27	
	Linseed ...	1,163	1,018	0 18 0	0 14 0	2,162	
	Arhar ...	5,480	29,044	0 32 8	0 30 0	35,746	
	Masur ...	182	205	0 26 0	0 20 0	315	
	Palihar ...	1 004	10,592	0 38 0	0 30 0	11,150	
	Dhán ...	8,516	90,270	1 3 8	0 35 0	83,007	
	Jarhan ...	9,140	1,13,103	1 3 0	0 35 0	1,05,216	
	Urd ...	5,286	22,069	0 25 0	0 19 0	35,310	
	Mung ...	35	151	0 20 0	0 16 0	303	
	Moihi ...	1,965	13,558	0 31 0	0 21 0	17,495	
	Kodon ...	150	649	1 10 0	1 0 0	519	
	Mendwa ...	66	351	1 0 0	0 32 0	351	
	Juar kalan ...	380	3,829	0 36 0	0 24 0	4,254	
	Juar khurd ...	51	674	0 36 0	0 24 0	571	
	Bájra ...	234	1,638	0 37 0	0 25 0	1,771	
	Patwa ...	21	8	0 14 0	0 10 0	23	
	Sugarcane ...	5,744	95,350	0 17 4	0 14 0	2,21,102	
	Poppy ...	279	56	0 0 4	0 0 1	8,960	
	Tobacco ...	52	1,092	1 20 0	0 4 0	728	
	Cotton ...	2	1	0 3 0	0 2 8	13	
	Kachiana ...	53	...	...	...	3,650	@ 50 per acre.
New fallow ...	256	...	...	...	...		
Indigo ...	202	...	...	...	...		
Total ...	99,319	...	...	...	13,01,895		

*Crop, amount and value of produce.*

Name of pargana	Name of crop.	Area under crop in acres.	Amount of produce in maunds of 50 lbs. each.	Price per rupee.		Value of outturn in rupees at harvest price.	Remarks.
				Harvest.	Average per year.		
				Mds. s. c	Mds s. c.	Rs.	
Sultanpur.	Wheat ...	21,157	2,81,388	0 25 8	0 20 0	4,41,393	
	Barley ...	8,213	86,647	0 38 0	0 30 0	91,208	
	Wheat and barley,	575	6,857	0 31 12	0 24 0	8,639	
	Pea ...	8,621	90,952	1 2 0	0 32 0	86,621	
	Barley and pea ...	20	211	1 2 8	0 32 0	198	
	Gram ...	9,136	94,674	0 33 0	0 28 0	1,14,756	
	Mustard ...	38	38	0 16 0	6 12 0	95	
	Linseed ...	311	272	0 18 0	0 14 0	605	
	Arhar ...	7,280	38,584	0 32 8	0 30 0	47,519	
	Masur ...	441	496	0 26 0	0 20 0	763	
	Dhan ...	14,379	15,247	1 3 8	0 35 0	1,40,154	
	Jarhan ...	3,145	38,919	1 3 0	0 35 0	36,204	
	Urd ...	6,419	26,799	0 25 0	0 19 0	42,879	
	Mung ...	56	242	0 20 0	0 16 0	484	
	Mothi ...	4,518	31,174	0 31 0	0 24 0	4,225	
	Cotton ...	434	217	0 3 0	0 2 8	2,893	
	Kodon ...	591	2,556	1 10 0	1 0 0	2,045	
	Mendwa ...	137	730	1 0 0	0 32 0	730	
	Juar kulan ...	988	9,954	0 35 0	0 24 0	11,060	
	Juar khurd ...	35	353	0 36 0	0 24 0	392	
	Bajra ...	513	3,591	0 37 0	0 25 0	3,882	
	Shakarkand ...	5	150	1 0 0	1 0 0	150	
	Sanai ...	34	170	0 10 0	0 8 0	680	
	Sugarcane ...	4,404	73,106	0 17 4	0 14 0	1,69,522	
	Poppy ...	380	76	0 0 4	0 0 0	12,160	
	Tobacco ...	59	11,239	1 20 0	0 4 0	826	
	Kachiana ...	222	...	...	...	11,100	@ 50 per acre.
	New fallow ...	499	...	...	...	...	
	Tetal ...	93,116	...	...	...	12,67,183	



*Crop, amount and value of produce.*

Name of pargana.	Name of crop.	Area under crop in acres.	Amount of produce in maunds of 80 lbs. each.	Price per rupee.		Value of outturn in rupees at harvest price.	Remarks.
				Harvest.	Average per year.		
				Mds. s. c	Mds. s. c.	Rs.	
Isauli.	Wheat ...	7,410	98,553	0 25 8	0 20 0	1,54,592	
	Barley ...	2,426	25,594	0 38 0	0 30 0	26,941	
	Wheat and barley, ...	148	1,765	0 31 12	0 24 0	2,223	
	Pea ...	3,149	33,222	1 2 1	0 32 0	31,640	
	Barley and pea ...	31	327	1 2 8	0 32 0	409	
	Gram ...	3,797	37,306	0 33 0	0 28 0	45,219	
	Mustard ...	1	1	0 16 0	0 12 0	3	
	Linseed ...	91	80	6 18 0	0 14 0	177	
	Arhar ...	4,343	23,018	0 32 3	0 30 0	23,330	
	Masur ...	105	118	0 26 0	0 20 0	182	
	Dhan ...	2,573	27,274	1 3 8	0 35 0	25,194	
	Jarhan ...	232	2,871	1 3 0	0 35 0	2,671	
	Urd ...	1,600	6,680	0 25 0	0 19 0	10,680	
	Mothi ...	1,759	12,137	0 31 0	0 24 0	15,661	
	Cotton ...	135	68	0 3 0	0 2 8	900	
	Kodo ...	197	852	1 10 0	1 0 0	682	
	Mundwa ...	60	320	1 0 0	0 32 0	320	
	Juar Kalan ...	291	2,932	0 35 0	0 24 0	3,258	
	Juar Khurd ...	196	1,975	0 36 0	0 24 0	2,194	
	Shakar Kand ...	192	5,766	1 0 0	1 0 0	5,760	
	Sugarcane ...	492	8,167	0 17 4	0 14 0	18,933	
	Poppy ...	260	52	0 0 4	0 0 1	8,320	
	Tobacco ...	13	272	1 26 0	0 4 0	182	
	Kachiona ...	87	...	...	...	4,350	@ Rs. 50 per acre.
	New follow ...	455	...	...	...	...	
	Total ...	30,043	...	...	...	3,88,334	



*No. III.—Rent rate statement.*

Number of circle.	Average rent rates of soils according to situation			Average rent rates deduced from deducted soils.				Proportion of rental borne by each plough.	Class rate.		Gross rental.					Rental now assumed and the revised	Rate at which the assumed rental falls on.		
	Goid.	Majhar.	Palo.	Irrigated goid.	Unirrigated goid.	Irrigated, not measured.	Neither irrigated nor measured.		Class.	Rate per acre.	As per columns 2 to 4.	As per columns 5 to 8.	As per column 9.	As per column 11.	As per rent-roll.		Goid.	Majhar.	Palo.
1									10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20

**No. IV.—Statistical statement.**

[illegible]

<i>Khartif.</i>		<i>Rabi.</i>		Corrected jamabandi.			
Name of crop.	Area. Big. bis.	Name of crop.	Area. Big. bis.	Area. Big. bis.	Rent. Rs. a. p.	Rate. Acre.	
				...			
				Resident ...			
				Non-resident			
				Total of assamis			
				Sir			
				Rent-free ...			
				Cultivated bagh			
				Fallow ...			
				Total villages			

Number in distribution register.	Revised demand of the demarcated mauza.	The names of the component holdings.	Summary settlement jama.	Revised jama.	Rate at which the new demand falls on.		
					Cultivation.	Culturable.	Total.

	Rs.	a.	p.
Plough jama	...		
Deducted "	...		
Rent-roll "	...		
Class "	...		
Total	...		
Average jama	...		



No. XIII.—Form A., see paras. 971 and 972.

[illegible]

No. XIII.—Form A., see paras 971 and 972—(concluded).

Number.	Name of talukdar or lumberdar.	Name of village.	Total cultivation where procurable.		POPULATION AND HOUSES	NUMBER OF PLOTS		IRRIGATED			GOIND AND IRRIGATION, DEDUCTED AT PARANA STANDARD.				SATAR.		DETAIL OF NET PRODUCE OF THE GOVERNMENT SHARE ACCORDING TO												
			Total in aqars.	Bighas.		Number of persons.	Number of cultivators with general rate of rent per cultivated.	Prevalent cultivating tribe.	Actual.	Non-resident.	Resident.	Estimated No. required to yield the frontier joint at 100 gams rate and rate per plough.	Pakka.	Khana.	Wells.	Goind.	Standard average per well and tank in Bighas.	Name of article.	Estimated value.	Ex-king's demands.	Average of both summary settlements.	Bent-roll.	Ploughs.	Cultivators.	Bent-roll as per zamindars committee.	Deducted from Goind and Irrigation.	Average of these seven months.		
1	2	3	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59
1	Shiu Nain Singh,	Arzanepur,	137	19	...	20	55	33	...	4	15	15	...	2	3	13	6-8	13-8	90	...	...	...	293	300	294	285	...	...	...
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS			Irrigated			Goind and Irrigation, Deducted at Parana Standard.			Satar.			Detail of Net Produce of the Government Share according to									
			Total cultivation where procurable.		Population and Houses			Number of PLOTS																					







## NOTE ON FINAL SETTLEMENT REPORT, FYZABAD DISTRICT.

---

I HAD arranged to write a note on Mr. Millett's final report on the settlement of the Fyzabad district during my privilege leave. As, however, the proof-sheets of that portion of Mr. Millett's report which deals with the original "assessment" and subsequent revision only reached me on the 24th June, I cannot now enter into any detailed review, and must confine my remarks to the limits of a very brief note.

2. This, however, is not, I think, to be regretted, (1) because I only joined this division after the settlement operations had been brought to a close, and have no personal knowledge to bring to bear on them ; and (2) because I find that as the assessment of each pargana was finished, separate reports were submitted to Government, and on a revision of Mr. Carnegy's assessments having been found necessary, this was also separately reported on by Messrs. Ferrar and Millett and by the then Commissioner, Mr. Capper, and the sanction of Government obtained to the revised assessments in the orders quoted in the margin of para. 1253 of Mr. Millett's final report.

3. Mr. Millett's report is very full, lengthy perhaps even to a fault, and gives more than a *resumé* from the pargana reports referred to above of statistical and historical information concerning the district, as also a very detailed account of the settlement operations proper in all its branches.

4. The demarcation of boundaries commenced in 1860, and in October, 1862, settlement operations were regularly started and continued till 31st October, 1878. I gather, however, that but for the revision of Mr. Carnegy's original assessment, settlement operations might have been brought to a close some years sooner.

5. The total cost of the Settlement is given as Rs. 8,77,167, which would more than swallow up the increase obtained in two years from the revision of settlement. In the

concluding paragraphs of Mr. Millett's report he explains the grounds on which a larger expenditure was to be expected in the settlement of this district, independent of the protracted duration of the operations consequent on the necessity of revising the demand originally proposed. In para. 1710 of his report will be found a list of the officers employed in the settlement. It appears, however, that the original assessment of the entire district was made by Mr. Carnegie, with the exception of a portion of pargana Sultanpur assessed by Major Erskine. In the case of certain parganas, however, Mr. Carnegie's assessments were based on the inspection notes of his assistants. The revision of the original assessment was carried out by Messrs Ferrar and Millett under very close supervision by the Commissioner, Mr. Capper, who, indeed, himself disposed of the petitions relating to 154 villages.

6. The Fyzabad district, as originally constituted, consisted of 13 parganas, three of which have since been transferred to the Sultanpur district, while the limits of many of the parganas have been modified since the settlement operations commenced.

7. The settlement under report is the first regular settlement of the district, and as the previous summary settlement was based on no detailed survey, it is of little use comparing the statistics of the two settlements, except, indeed, the State's demand as fixed under each. Regarding the increase in cultivation which the figures of the regular settlement survey disclose, while there can, I should think, be little doubt that, notwithstanding the disturbances of 1857-58, a considerable increase in cultivation did take place in the interval between annexation and the regular settlement, still I observe it is a debateable point to what extent the increase disclosed by the recent survey is real, and to what extent fictitious and attributable to a concealment of existing cultivation at the time of the summary settlement. The following statement exhibits the result of the assessment under the present settlement as compared with the summary settlement for each pargana as *ultimately* constituted, the first 10 parganas in the list being those now comprised in the Fyzabad district, the last three those which have been transferred to Sultanpur,

Parganah.	Summary set- tlement de- mand.	Regular settlement now under report.		Percentage of increase of revised jama over sum- mary settlement.	Rate of incidence of revised jama on				Date from which jama took effect.	Date from which revised jama took effect.
		Jama original- ly proposed.	Revised jama.		Cultivated area.	Malguzari area.	Total area.			
								Rs. a. p.		
Haveli Oudh	74,673 3 0	97,504 0 0	92,571 0 0	23.97	2 0 11	1 10 6	1 2 3	1277	1283	
Mangalsi	87,831 4 6	1,05,692 0 0	94,470 0 0	7.56	2 0 6	1 11 1	1 4 3	1277	1283	
Amsin	50,447 15 6	78,143 0 0	73,633 0 0	43.95	1 13 7	1 8 3	1 2 8	1275	1284	
Pachhimraih	1,96,996 12 4	2,62,700 0 0	2,42,408 0 0	23.5	1 14 9	1 6 10	1 1 4	1277	1283	
Khandansa	50,786 0 0	86,438 0 0	80,549 0 0	58.61	1 14 8	1 6 10	1 1 3	1278	1285	
Akbarpur	1,18,327 3 6	1,74,970 0 0	1,66,926 0 0	41.19	2 0 3	1 8 10	0 15 11	1275	1285	
Matihaura	70,748 11 0	97,913 0 0	89,136 0 0	25.99	1 13 9	1 7 1	1 1 3	1274	1283	
Tanda	60,344 0 0	84,633 0 0	81,986 0 0	35.86	1 11 11	1 7 4	1 0 7	1274	1284	
Bithar	93,552 0 0	1,49,166 0 0	1,41,453 0 0	54.41	1 13 6	1 6 3	1 0 4	1274	1284	
Surhurpur	66,491 12 0	98,941 0 0	94,330 0 0	41.87	1 14 2	1 7 6	1 0 4	1274	1283	
Total	8,70,097 12 10	12,35,800 0 0	11,60,462 0 0	33.37	1 14 8	1 7 10	1 1 2	...	...	
Aldeman	1,57,842 12 0	2,22,875 0 0	2,02,446 0 0	46.87	2 0 8	1 9 6	1 0 5	1275	1283	
Saitkaupur	1,44,392 14 3	1,91,613 0 0	1,82,180 0 0	26.17	1 15 4	1 7 5	1 1 7	1278	1284	
Isauli	56,217 6 6	73,073 0 0	65,972 0 0	17.35	2 3 2	1 9 5	1 0 3	1278	1284	
Total	3,38,453 0 9	4,56,561 0 0	4,50,597 0 0	33.13	2 0 5	1 8 7	1 1 2	...	...	
GRAND TOTAL	12,08,560 13 7	17,22,361 0 0	16,11,059 0 0	33.80	...	...	...	...	...	

8. The revised jama which has been sanctioned by the Local Government therefore gives for the entire area brought under settlement an annual increase of Rs. 4,02,508-2-5 on the summary settlement demand, or in round numbers an increase of over 33 per cent. This is exclusive of cesses, and as the amount of the latter, calculated on the land-revenue demand, has increased since the summary settlement, if cesses are included, the percentage of increase on the gross demand to be met by the Zemindars under the present settlement will be considerably in excess of that given above.

9. It is necessary, however, here to note that the revised demand ultimately sanctioned, as shown above, does not in some cases take effect from the dates entered in column 10, progressive jamas having been allowed where the increase in the former demand was very great. The extent to which progressive jamas have been allowed will be seen from appendix V. a. of Mr. Millett's report. It would seem proper also to note here that in parganah Khandansa, for special reasons partly on account of the unusual largeness of the rise and the suddenness with which it was imposed, partly on account of the complex nature of the tenures generally, and the numerous proprietary communities, whose right as sharers, superior proprietors, or subordinate holders had not been defined when the new assessments were introduced a progressive jama, by which the original demand was temporarily reduced to Rs. 71,452-7-0, exclusive of cesses, was sanctioned in May, 1870, and the imposition of the full assessment was postponed till 1880. In the case of this parganah therefore, where under Mr. Millett's revision the sum fixed was less than the provisional ten years' jama, immediate effect (from 1286 fasli, or 1st July, 1877) was given to the reductions, while in other cases the alterations made in the full demand by Mr. Millett are only to take effect at the expiration of the ten years' term, for which a temporarily reduced assessment was fixed in 1870, *i.e.*, on 1st July, 1880.

10. In parganah Aldemau it would also appear that Mr. Carnegy's full assessment was never actually imposed, but for somewhat similar reasons to those referred to in the case of pargana Khandansa an all-round reduction of 12 per cent. was allowed as a temporary measure. This reduced assessment

was in force when the revision took place in 1875, and the effect of the revision was in some cases to enhance the demand previously in force. In such cases the revision having been sanctioned in 1284 fasli, the enhancement was not given effect to till 1285 (July, 1877). In other cases the revisions took effect from 1283 fasli, the agricultural year in which they were made.

11. The method adopted by Mr. Carnegy in assessing this district is so well known, has been so often before Government and the subject of official discussion and report, that it would seem unnecessary for me to do much more than allude to it here (Mr. Millett has given full details in his final report, quoting from Mr. Carnegy's parganah reports). Mr. Carnegy started with four tests, *viz.*, the plough jama, the deduced jama (from rates applied to manured, unmanured, irrigated, and unirrigated land), the rent-roll jama, and the class jama, for the assessment of cultivated land; and as regards "culturable waste," his rules were, (1) to put 3 annas an acre on such an extent of it as he considered a necessary complement of the cultivated area for grazing and such like purposes and 13 annas per acre on all culturable land in excess of such complement, while (2) in the case of groves any excess over 10 per cent. of the total area was treated and assessed as culturable waste. No allowance was made for a sudden, heavy rise either in the shape of a rasadi jama or otherwise, and no allowance was deemed necessary where, on account of existence of sub-proprietary tenures, the margin of profit was greatly curtailed.

12. Guided by the above rules in framing it, Mr. Carnegy, I understand, claimed for his assessment that it was a *moderate* one; but making every allowance for the unfortuitous circumstances which his settlement has had to contend against which would make a really moderate assessment press heavily, I must say that neither the actual results nor the general rules adopted by Mr. Carnegy for his guidance seem to afford much ground for characterizing his assessment generally as "moderate" or "easy." There appears to me to have been many elements of uncertainty and error in some of his "test" standards which undoubtedly gave rise to over-assessment, a point alluded to in Mr. Ferrar's note on the proposed revision

and noticed at some length in Mr. Millett's final report. I entirely agree with the opinion expressed by Mr. Capper in connection with this matter, that "it is a subject for much regret that the assessment should have been based on a conglomeration of various calculations which different settlement officers had reported as useful tests wherewith to check returns which had been given to them as representing actual assets or their estimated corrections of these papers." Mr. Carnegie at no very advanced stage of the assessment work abandoned the plough jama as a standard, and subsequently also the "deduced jama." In his latter assessments also he seems to have but partially given effect to his harsh rule regarding the assessment of culturable waste at a revenue-rate of 3 annas and 13 annas per acre, and in the case of parganah Khandansa, the last assessed, this rule was set aside altogether owing to the enormous increase which the revised assessment of the cultivated area gave. Mr. Carnegie evidently laid great stress on "personal inspection" by the assessing officer (paras. 946-948 of Mr. Millett's report), but he does not seem to have considered it possible by such personal inspection and local enquiry to obtain approximately reliable information regarding *actually current* rates which would enable a practically useful amended rent-roll for each village to be drawn up. There were doubtless special difficulties in the way of this being successfully accomplished in Fyzabad, still there can be no doubt that amended village rent-rolls, showing *actual rates* as far as these can be ascertained, on a *personal inspection of the village by the assessing officer*, afford one of the safest guides to a fair assessment, and that where every village was carefully inspected by the assessing officer, had the ascertainment of actual rates been made one of the principal objects of his inspection, a much sounder basis of assessment would have been obtained than that offered by most of the tests applied in the Fyzabad district. Apart, however, from the question of actual over-assessment, it has been distinctly shown that the precipitate introduction of the new demand before rights were defined, or arrangements matured between the proprietary and cultivating classes, the sudden largeness of the rise in many cases without provision for its taking effect gradually, a succession of very bad seasons—all these and other like matters had much to do with the accrual of the large

balances immediately after the introduction of Mr. Carnegie's assessment, as also with the numerous objections which were filed against them long after they had been published and given effect to. The points alluded to above and the fact that no allowance was made in fixing the demand on estates in which properties of different kinds existed, together with the cases of "judicial over-assessment" of sub-proprietor's rent, referred to in Mr. Millett's report, would have been sufficient to convert an assessment in itself moderate and fair into a grinding tax, which the original assessment certainly was felt to be until temporary relief was granted and subsequent revision sanctioned—a tax which could only have been collected at the sacrifice of most of the under-proprietary tenures in the district, and from which abatement would have been absolutely necessary when any serious failure of either harvest occurred.

13. The necessity of a revision having been recognized, Government approved of the principles on which it should be carried out as embodied in a note drawn up by Mr. Capper in December, 1874 ; these are detailed in para. 1058 of Mr. Millett's report, and it would seem unnecessary to refer to them further here than to note that Mr. Carnegie's assessments had never been even provisionally sanctioned by the Chief Commissioner, and that the action taken was no interference with, or revision of, an assessment which had come under review by the chief revenue authority of the province and met with his provisional sanction.

14. Mr. Millett has entered in his report most fully into the considerations on which the principles laid down for guidance in carrying out the revision are founded, and the method in which they were applied. It would seem unnecessary for me to give any resumé of his report. It shows in very great detail how the work of revision was carried out, and the measures taken to satisfy the revising officer before any reduction of the original assessment was proposed.

15. In no case was reduction proposed without a personal inspection, once if not oftener, of the village by the Settlement Officer. In many cases the objections were disallowed without inspecting the village when the Settlement Officer



was satisfied from a preliminary enquiry that the plea of over-assessment was not well founded. On the other hand, many villages were inspected in which no reduction was found necessary.

16. The 13 parganas constituting the old district of Fyzabad comprised 3,601 villages. Regarding 2,645 of these villages, 4,175 petitions objecting to the assessment were filed. Of these petitions, 2,382 pertaining to 1,506 villages were successful. The petitions referred to 666 maháls, and the reductions were granted in 544 maháls. The reduction granted was, exclusive of cesses, Rs. 1,11,304-2-8, or inclusive of cesses, Rs. 1,14,084-8-0.

17. These figures are struck on the full revised demand, irrespective of the progressive assessments detailed in appendix Va., and the actual relief given was therefore larger than the above figures show.

18. The reductions granted amount to 6 per cent. of the original assessment of the entire district, to about 8 per cent. of that portion of it which came under revision, and to about 14 per cent. of that portion of it in which reductions were granted.

19. This was certainly a substantial measure of relief to the particular villages concerned. Besides relief granted by actual reductions, in other cases inequalities of assessment were removed by a redistribution of the revenue demand. These were cases in which the assessment of a mauza was not open to objection, but the latter pertaining to several maháls, the distribution over its component parts was faulty and at variance with the data on which the mauza had been assessed.

20. I gather from the papers connected with the revision that there are many instances in which, had the work been one of original assessment instead of review, the demand would have been fixed lower, and that similarly there were cases in which an enhancement of the first assessment might have been proposed. No mauzawar reductions were granted when the amount fell short of 5 per cent., and in some instances where it was found that a reduction exceeding that amount in a component village caused an inappreciably small percentage of decrease in the jama of the mahál

even reductions amounting to 5 per cent. of the assessment on individual villages were disallowed. Unless the assessment of the entire district was to be done *de novo*, for which it was agreed there was no necessity, I do not see that any other course than that described in the cases referred to could have been adopted.

21. From what has been stated, it appears that 57 per cent. of the petitions complaining of over-assessments succeeded. Now, bearing in mind how apt natives are in such matters to follow suit with or without sufficient reason, and the fact that nothing under 5 per cent. was accepted as over-assessment calling for revision, I think the percentage of success obtained and the amount struck off as excessive fully justifies the opinion of those officers who held that there was a strong case for revision; at the same time I think we have now the strongest grounds for believing that the revised assessments are fair and equable.

22. The circumstances of nearly three-fourths of the villages originally assessed were in the course of this revision brought under special scrutiny, and a large majority of these were subjected to a local inspection and enquiry, conducted with special care and intelligence (as the English notes recorded in each case by the Settlement Officer testify), with the sole or main object of ascertaining if they had been over-assessed to any material extent. A consideration of these facts should, I think, afford a considerable degree of confidence that no material error of over-assessment can have escaped detection in the 2,645 villages which were brought under special scrutiny, while the absence of any complaint, notwithstanding the facilities afforded for presenting them, on the part of the proprietors and sub-proprietors of the remaining 956 villages comprised in the settlement district, seems to me to afford equally strong grounds of assurance that none of these villages were over-assessed in the first instance.

23. If the revised assessments sanctioned by the local Government press anywhere too heavily—and I write this not merely with reference to the settlement papers before me, but with reference to the slight knowledge I have acquired

of the district during the last 20 months—it is in the case of sub-settled tenures, in many of which the rent payable to the superior proprietor, if the wages of village servants are added, amounts to 80 per cent. or more of the gross rental. In the recent revision relief was frequently given in such cases by a reduction from the gross rental varying from 5 to 12 per cent., seldom, however, exceeding 10. I fear, however, although such cases cannot be said to be cases of over-assessment, with reference to the principles on which sub-settlements were made, yet the settlement terms still continue to press heavily in not a few of the sub-proprietary tenures, and that the result will be, in the course of a few years, a considerable reduction in their number. This, however, should it take place, can hardly be attributed to over-assessment strictly speaking, but rather to the system adopted, which, while it maintained the possession and right to a sub-settlement of the sub-proprietary class, assigned to them so small a share of the gross rental as practically reduced them to a worse position than that of ex-proprietary tenants in the North-Western Provinces. I would with all deference submit that if it was deemed right and proper to maintain the possession of this class,—of which I have no doubt,—they should have been secured a somewhat better position, one which would have enabled them to maintain the status of substantial middlemen, and that a maximum allowance of 20 per cent. on the Government demand would have been a sufficient allowance to the talúkdars in such cases. There can be no doubt that the absorption of these sub-proprietary rights, or, in other words, the extinction of the sub-proprietary class, which has already begun, is creating a class of discontented, if not disloyal, people among our upper class tenantry, who are further to a great extent deprived of service as a means of employment which was open to them under the Nawábi régime. Mr. Millett's report shows that no less than 1,713 out of the 3,601 villages in the old district are sub-settled, the aggregate area of these villages being 347,264 acres, and the number of sub-proprietors 24,000, who enjoy, under the revised assessment, an average profit of Rs. 9-11-4 each per annum.

24. Mr. Millett in his report gives much interesting information in section IV., Part I., regarding litigation in the Settlement Department, which was very heavy in this district.

From the latter it appears that, besides the sub-settled estates referred to above, 39,646 acres were decreed as *sir*, *dihdari*, and *duswant* to ex-proprietors, the estimated rental of which is put at Rs. 1,63,979, out of which the decree-holders retain 65,024, while 11,118 acres were similarly decreed to ex-proprietors in "occupancy" tenure, the rental of the latter being Rs. 45,826, and the occupancy-holders paying Rs. 41,398. The area decreed as "shankalp" and "birt" is not stated, but it appears that 1,168 claims of this description were decreed by consent or under compromise and 1,360 on trial.

25. The manner in which the settlement records were prepared is fully described in section IV., Part II. The Form of some of the papers is not uniform throughout the district, but the reason of this is explained, and the report shows very distinctly that much labor and pains were taken to make the settlement record as complete and perfect as possible. Engagements were properly taken for each *mahál*; but from para. 1627 it would appear that when a *mahál* consists of parts lying in different *parganahs*, each *parganahwar* part has been treated as a separate *mahál* under the name of the principal village in the *parganah*.

26. The arrangement referred to in para. 1692, by which *maháls* paying a revenue of less than Rs. 200 were doubled up for *kabuliyat* purposes with some larger *mahál*, although adopted, doubtless, with the object of simplification by avoiding, as far as practicable, a multiplicity of petty properties, seems to me one of doubtful expediency and legality, unless the *maháls* doubled up were formerly part of one *mauza* or *zemindari*. Even in the latter case the full consent of the parties interested would be a *sine quâ non*—indeed, the law requires a written application from them. Unless the union of estates is carried out with due regard to such considerations, it is certain to give rise to complaints of the nature referred to in para. 1692, and may lead to serious hardship by a hasty application of the principle of joint responsibility.

27. It is, I think, to be regretted (para. 1642) that the instructions in Financial Commissioner's Book Circular No. 7 of 1865, which required the fields possessed by disconnected

proprietors to be distinctively coloured in the field maps of all villages held "ketbut" by several maháls, were not fully carried out. The greater the sub-division in such cases, the greater is the necessity of having it distinctly shown in the field map. The assessment is originally made mauzawar, and must necessarily be so, as the mauza is the unit of survey, and must be the unit of inspection and all memoranda regarding capability, rent-rates, and assets. To secure an equable distribution in different properties in the case of mauzas held ketbut, it is essential that the assessing officer, when inspecting the village, should have before him the Field Map indicating the mahálwar allotment, so that in the event of any mahál having an undue proportion of either superior or inferior land, differentially rated for assessment purposes, a note may be made of the fact for future attention when the assessment comes to be distributed among the component maháls. Mr. Millett in paras. 1061-62 discusses the question whether the No. II. statement should be prepared mauzawar or mahálwar. It might be very desirable to have a mahálwar series of No. II. statements, although I do not see that such a series is absolutely required; but for the reason I have stated above, the village being the unit of survey, inspection, and assessment, a mauzawar No. II. statement, on which the settlement officer records the ground of his assessment, seems to me absolutely indispensable.

28. Regarding villages subject to fluvial action, Mr. Millett (para. 1693) simply remarks: "the usual conditions regarding revision of assessment are entered in the kabuliat." From this and from para. 1533, it would appear that in no cases have short-term settlements of alluvial land been made under the provisions of paras. 3 and 4 of Settlement Ruling No. 9. Even with the limited knowledge I have of the Fyzabad district, the absence of any such settlements seemed to me somewhat strange, and I accordingly instituted enquiries in the Deputy Commissioner's office on the point, and have ascertained that, although no mention of the fact is made in the report, one Manjha, viz. Manjha Nidhura, in parganah Mangalsi, was settled for a term of five years only (from 1285 fasli) by Mr. Ferrar. The fact that the assessment was made by the latter officer may account for the absence of any allusion to it in the Final report which is submitted

by Mr. Millett ; but it is surprising that in the 30 years' jama statement, the five years' jama should have erroneously been carried forward for the full term of the settlement.

29. It appears to me that the terms of Settlement Ruling No. 9, paras. 3 and 4, have been generally overlooked, and that there are a great many instances of manjha land, which, under the terms of the said Ruling, should be settled for a term of five years only. I would invite His Honor's attention to the description of such lands, generally, given in para. 1002 of Mr. Millett's report; "lowlying tracts, intersected often by broad streams, branches of the Gogra, or backwaters of the river, liable to inundations in the rainy season, when not steadily under water at that time, &c., &c.;" and I would suggest that a list of such alluvial tracts be called for from the Deputy Commissioner at once, and that, in their case, the settlement now reported be sanctioned for a period of five years only.

30. The enquiries made under the new alluvion and diluvion rules will enable the Deputy Commissioner to supply the information required with very little trouble; but unless Government limit the term of settlement to five years in the case of such Manjhas, in passing final orders on the settlement of the district, it will be impossible to secure the object in view by any action taken under the alluvion rules, as the latter allow the proprietors to elect either for the period entered in the kabuliyat and periodical revisions on actual increment or decrement, or for the term of five years with quinquennial revisions on existing assets, and I understand that with rare exceptions the zemindars have signified their wish to stand by the kabuliyat. The cases in question, however, being cases in which the Settlement Officer should, according to the rules in force, have limited the term of the settlement, Government can of course, on passing final orders on the settlement of the district, limit the term in these particular cases to five years.

31. Some six or seven cases of Manjhas in which the question of over-assessment was mixed up with that of alluvial increment, and which had not been disposed of with the ordinary cases of over-assessment, have come before me.

By accepting a five years' settlement under the alluvion rules, the proprietors could, in all these cases, obtain an immediate revision on the assets of the mahál. With one exception, however, they have all declined this. In the exception, referred to, a reduction will be granted by revision under the alluvial rules if the actual assets call for it; in the other cases, the parties having declined the five years' rule, and there being no clear case of serious over-assessment and no arrears due, I have, of course, declined to allow the settlement assessment to be re-opened.

32. In conclusion, I would observe that while the incidence of assessment is, I believe, somewhat lower in Fyzabad than in many of the cis-Gogra districts of Oudh, this must not be taken as a proof of under-assessment. The extraordinary frequency of double tenures must be borne in mind, for, in the case of sub-tenures, the State's demand does not represent the burden which the proprietary class, with whom the settlement has been made, have to bear; in such cases the rent, over and above the State's demand, which the sub-proprietary class have to pay to their superiors, must be taken into account to ascertain the real pressure of the settlement on the proprietary class in possession. There may be other reasons for a lighter incidence in Fyzabad, as compared with other cis-Gogra districts; but I am not sufficiently acquainted with Oudh to express my opinion on this point. I have no hesitation, however, in saying that, as far as my short experience in this division enables me to judge, the assessment of the Fyzabad district, as ultimately revised, is by no means a light one.

33. It is not for me, who joined the division after the settlement operations had been closed, to express my opinion on the merits of the various officers engaged in them, and the labor and ability they brought to bear on the very troublesome and arduous duties entrusted to them. His Honor has already acknowledged the services rendered by Mr. Capper, late Commissioner of the Division, and by Mr. Millett and his subordinates. The work of revision, which devolved chiefly on Messrs. Ferrar and Millett as Settlement Officers and Mr. Capper as Commissioner, was a specially intricate, difficult, and laborious task, besides being an invidi-

ous one. To revise another officer's assessment is always a much more troublesome operation than to frame a new one on measurements conducted under the immediate supervision of the assessing officer, and it appears to me very doubtful whether, in the case of this revision, the labor and care bestowed on it was not greater than in the case of the original assessment. Mr. Millett is entitled to thanks for the labour he bestowed in compiling the final report during his recent term of furlough. While it might, I think, have been compressed into somewhat less space, it will afford, in a compact form, a valuable record for future reference on all points connected with the long-protracted settlement of the Fyzabad district.

JOHN J. F. LUMSDEN,

*Commissioner.*

FYZABAD,        }  
*The 30th June, 1880.* }





No. 1000R. of 1882.

RESOLUTION.

ODDH REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

*Dated Allahabad, the 6th April, 1882.*

READ—

The final settlement report of the Fyzabad district, by Mr. A. F. Millett, C.S.,  
Officiating Settlement Officer.

**OBSERVATION.**—Settlement operations were in progress throughout the Fyzabad district from October, 1862, to the 31st October, 1878. The original revision was conducted by and under the orders of Mr. Carnegy. His assessments were declared and introduced without having received formal sanction at various times between April, 1865, and November, 1870. No complaints against the assessment were made up to the year 1872, when its propriety was first called in question. In 1873 and the following year there was a great influx of objections resulting in a revision of Mr. Carnegy's proposals, carried out by Messrs. Ferrar and Millett, Settlement Officers, acting under the immediate control of Mr. W. C. Capper, the Commissioner of the division. The final report, which gives a most detailed account of all the proceedings connected with the settlement from its commencement to its close, is submitted by Mr. Millett.

2. The settlement district treated of in his report is not co-extensive with the area of the Fyzabad district as at present constituted. In 1869 three out of thirteen parganas were transferred to Sultanpur which bounds it on the south, and the limits of the remaining ten have undergone several modifications.

3. The area of the original district was 2,344 square miles. The population 1,440,957, or 614 to the square mile, a density exceeded in only two districts of the province, Lucknow and Bara Banki : 66 per cent. of the population is agricultural, and the proportion of high castes, Brahmins, and Chattris, is one-fourth of the whole.

4. Mr. Millett draws a gloomy picture of the condition of the people. The large proprietors were, as a rule, heavily embarrassed before the settlement commenced, and even the light summary demand was realized from them with difficulty. The minute sub-division of property, with its unusually complicated form, yielding to each co-sharer a pittance of Rs. 17 a year, the effect of annexation in closing the doors of service, as soldiers or retainers, and the heavy expenses of litigation, have contributed to the general indebtedness of the petty proprietors and more especially of sub-settlement holders, while with regard to the cultivating class Mr. Millett mentions the suggestive fact, that Fyzabad furnishes more emigrants than the other eleven districts of the province put together.

5. One of the most striking features in the agricultural economy of the district is the number and variety of subordinate rights in the soil. Out of the 3,601 demarcated villages, 2,414 are the property of talukdars, and 1,713 of these, with an aggregate area of 347,264 acres, and a Government demand of Rs. 4,05,687, are held in sub-settlement by 24,000 under-proprietors, each of whom enjoys an average yearly profit of Rs. 9-11-4. This is of course in addition to the cultivating profits they receive on the lands in their personal tillage. Including all the various classes of sub-proprietary rights, the area awarded to the holders was 438,611 acres, that is, nearly one-third of the total area of the district.

6. The revenue survey was completed in 1865. The field survey, commencing in October, 1862, or about the same time as the revenue survey, ended in 1869. The total areas tally fairly, but there is a considerable discrepancy in the returns of cultivation, of which no explanation is given. The figures are—

Revenue survey	...	...	930,229
Field survey	...	...	880,693
			<hr/> 99,536 <hr/>

There seems, however, to be a misprint, both in the figures given in para. 942 of the report and appendix No. I.

## 7. The details of the field survey were—

Cultivation	...	...	55 per cent.
Culturable	...	...	17 per cent.
Groves	...	...	5 per cent.
Barren	...	...	23 per cent.

Such were some of the conditions with which the settlement officer had to deal, and from the description given by Mr. Millett in Mr. Carnegie's own language of that officer's system of assessment, it is clear that he dealt with them in a procrustean method which was singularly inapplicable. His assessment was mainly based on conjectural data—useful, indeed, as checks, but unsafe as a foundation. Assuming, too readily, the impossibility of ascertaining, with approximate accuracy, the rental received by the proprietor, he abandoned that laborious investigation and analysis of rent-rolls, which should invariably accompany an assessment on average rent-rates. He spread his assumed rates which, though fair on the good, were heavy on the inferior soils, over the assessable area, without due regard to the prevalence of high-caste cultivation, or the existence of more than one right of property in the soil. His assessment of waste was characterized in most parganas by an undue severity, and through a misconception of the orders of the Supreme

Para. 1157.

Government progressive jamas were avoided, as much as possible, even to quote one instance given by Mr. Millett in the case of a sixfold enhancement of the revenue. In justice, however, to Mr. Carnegie and the other officers, who, under his guidance, conducted the first assessment, it must be said, that with regard to the two points of making allowances in estimating assets for the presence of high-caste cultivators, and the amount intercepted by sub-proprietors, and the necessity of progressive assessments, where there has been a large enhancement, their errors were due to the instructions given them for their guidance. The principle of making these allowances was not at that time generally acknowledged, while the benefits of a system of progressive assessments has only been fully recognized since their work was completed.

8. The effect of Mr. Carnegie's assessment was to raise the Government demand from Rs. 12,08,550 to Rs. 17,65,429,

inclusive of cesses, an increase of 42 per cent. Owing to the financial exigencies of the empire, this greatly enhanced demand was precipitately imposed upon the people, in nine parganas before the landlords had time to make the necessary rent arrangements with their tenants, and generally throughout the district, while settlement litigation with all its expenses was in progress, and the determination of rights in the soil far from complete. Of all the causes which contributed to the failure of the first assessment, its too sudden imposition was, in Sir George Couper's opinion, one of the most disastrous.

9. From the commencement in 1866 friction was observed in the working of the settlement. Balances began to accrue and became a source of anxiety to the revenue administration. The floods of 1871, "the worst year on record or known even to tradition," brought matters to a crisis, necessitating temporary relief in the form of a remission equalling one-fourth of a year's demand. It got into the air that the settlement was to be revised, and petitions against the assessment poured in upon the authorities.

10. Mr. Millett gives a very clear and connected account of the procedure that was followed in the disposal of these petitions, and of the principles on which the assessment was revised. A distinction was properly drawn between cases in which there appeared to be actual over-assessment, and those in which other causes rendered the pressure of the enhanced demand unduly heavy.

11. In all cases of the former description a preliminary enquiry was made to ascertain whether the objector had a *prima facie* ground of complaint. If he had, a local investigation was made by the settlement officer or one of his assistants.

12. The principles which were laid down for their guidance, with the approval and sanction of the local Government, are detailed in para. 1058 of the report. They cover all the points in which Mr. Carnegie's system was defective. Greater weight was attached to the rent-rolls which were carefully tested. Allowances were made for intermittent cultivation owing to pooriness of soil, preva-

lence of high-caste cultivators, bad debts, vicissitudes of seasons, double or treble property in land. Waste was generally exempted. In cases of great and sudden enhancement it was introduced progressively. Faulty distributions of the revenue were corrected, and finally retrospective effect was given to reductions of assessment, when the circumstances of the case called for it. Besides the general remission of one-fourth of the revenue made in 1873, amounting to Rs. 2,96,422, further remissions were given in the cases where the assessment was reduced with retrospective effect, amounting in all to Rs. 1,46,992.

13. The revisions were reported pargana by pargana, and sanctioned by His Honor provisionally. It is unnecessary therefore for him to review them in detail. Objections relating to 2,645 villages out of 3,601 were filed, and in 1,506, i.e., in 41 per cent. of all the villages in the district, reductions of assessment were allowed amounting to Rs. 1,11,304-2-8 without and Rs. 1,14,084-8-0 with cesses.

14. The reductions equalled 6 per cent. of the original demand, about 8 per cent. of that portion of it which came under examination, and 14 per cent. of that part of it which was modified. Sir George Couper fully shares Mr. Lumsden's confidence that no material error of over-assessment can have escaped notice in the 2,645 villages which came under special investigation, while the absence of any complaint from the owners of the remaining 956 is an assurance that their original assessment was a fair one. The revenue was collected in 1879 with a balance of only Rs. 191; in 1880 and 1881 the balance sheet has been completely clear. This result has been reached without the use of a single process of severity. Fifty-five estates constituting an entire pargana, have been made khám in 1880 and 1881, but this measure was adopted, in fact, as a preliminary to a re-adjustment of the properties whose intermixture was so extraordinary as to produce results equally disastrous to the tenantry and the proprietors. The re-adjustment is almost completed, and the estates will be then discharged.

15. The result of the settlement is to impose a demand, excluding cesses, of Rs. 16,51,342-3-5—an increase of 33·81 per cent. on the summary demand. The incidence

compared with that of neighbouring districts is light, as the following figures will show :—

			On cultivation.		
			Rs.	a.	p.
Fyzabad	...	...	1	15	2
Rae Bareli	...	...	2	6	4
Sultanpur	...	...	2	2	9
Bara Banki	...	...	2	3	10
Azamgarh	...	...	2	4	4

Sir George Couper is satisfied that the assessment is not higher than the exceptional circumstances of the district absolutely demand, and he is pleased to sanction it, subject to the approval of the Government of India, for a period of thirty years from the date of its introduction in the several parganas of the district.

16. The Commissioner, in para 28 of his review, mentions that the engagements in riparian villages have, with one exception, been taken for the full period of thirty years, and suggests that, as the settlements have not yet been confirmed, these engagements might be recalled and a quinquennial engagement enforced. The orders of Government in this matter at the time of the assessment were not very distinct, and the Lieutenant-Governor has found that the practice in the Fyzabad settlement was general throughout the other districts. A quinquennial settlement in such cases is probably best for all parties, but he would not willingly disturb an arrangement of such old-standing without the consent of the zamindars themselves. Subject of course to the sanction of the Government of India, the settlement of these riparian lands will therefore stand,

17. In the 23rd para. of his note on Mr. Millett's report, Mr. Lumsden remarks on the probable effect of the revised assessment on the sub-proprietors who occupy such an important position in the Fyzabad district. The condition and prospects of this class have been and will continue to be a source of anxiety to the revenue administration. The district has been during the last four years in the charge of an officer, who had the decision of a large number of the sub-settlement suits brought in this district, and who has interested himself warmly in the affairs of these under-proprietors. After a series of meetings in which he

warned them that, as the only means of preserving their heritages to their children, he would unflinchingly keep them to the punctual payment of their current rents he brought into use the new powers given to the Deputy Commissioner by section 158 of the Oudh Land Revenue Act. The number of applications under this section was never large. The total number of sub-settled estates is 1,341. In 1878, the applications to the Deputy Commissioner for assistance in the realization of current rents were 379 ; in 1879, 228 ; in 1880, 164 ; in 1881, 132 ; and, in the great majority of the sub-settlements, the payment of the rent is now voluntarily punctual.

18. There remains the matter of the arrears of past years covered by decrees of the rent court. These are realized under section 125 of the Rent Act, which gives plenary power to the Deputy Commissioner. The Deputy Commissioner reports that he has a careful settlement of accounts made as a preliminary. Disputes between the co-parceners as to their respective shares in the total debt is a constant cause of the growth of indebtedness. Once the precise state of affairs is known, the collection of the debt becomes more easy than might be anticipated. If all the co-parceners cannot meet their obligations, some solvent sharer is almost always found ready to pay the balance under the traditional condition of a transfer of the defaulting share. The number of sub-settled estates brought under the Deputy Commissioner's charge in 1879 was 55 ; in 1880, 40 ; in 1881, 15.

19. The measures taken during the last four years to realize arrears, which had accrued during a period of unpunctual payments, and to maintain a punctuality which was unusual and irksome, necessitated the displacement of the insolvent partners in the sub-settled communities. The recorded transfers of the last five years show the conveyance by sale, voluntary or compulsory, in the sub-settled estates, of an area amounting in all to 16,315 acres. The sub-settled area, according to the report (para. 1596), is 347,264 acres. The area mortgaged is not shown in the registers, but it is fairly satisfactory to find that complete transfer of the proprietary right has not exceeded 5 per cent. of the whole.



20. The Deputy Commissioner concludes his last report with the hope that, with the punctual payment of current rents, that is now enforced, and the disappearance of the load of the decreed debt of the past, the under-proprietary difficulties of the district will now abate ; and in this hope the Lieutenant-Governor joins.

21. In 1876, one-third of the entire talukdari area of the district was under the management of the district officer, under the provisions of the Encumbered Estates Act. The rental of these estates was upwards of six and a half lakhs of rupees. The debts have been gradually paid off, and in 1881 there remained, after the discharge of such estates as had been cleared of debt, portions of three estates, with a rental of Rs. 80,000.

22. Sir George Couper has already remarked on the extent to which the defects in Mr. Carnegy's system of assessments were due to the ambiguous and in some cases mistaken instructions first issued for the conduct of the settlement. But the main feature of it was, that it was based on deduced statistics without proper enquiry into actual assets, a mode of assessment that is apt to sow the seeds of future revenue difficulties. At the same time Mr. Carnegy spared no pains to verify his deductions, and the thought and labour he bestowed on the Fyzabad settlement entitle him to the acknowledgments of the Government. Messrs. Ferrar and Millett performed the delicate task of revision, with carefulness and tact, and the Lieutenant-Governor and Chief Commissioner is indebted to Mr. Capper, the Commissioner of the division, for the vigilant control he exercised over his subordinates.

23. Mr. Millett deserves commendation for the completeness of his report. He did the great bulk of the revision of the assessment, and he has reported it with great fairness and precision.

By order, &c.,

J. WOODBURN,

*Secy. to Govt., N.-W. P. and Oudh,  
in the Oudh Rev. Dept.*

No.  $\frac{801}{119-6}$  R., dated Simla, the 21st August, 1883.

From—T. W. HOLDERNESS, ESQ, C.S.,  
*Offg. Under-Secy. to Govt. of India,*  
*Rev. & Agri. Dept. (Rev.),*

To—Secy. to Govt., N.-W. P. and Oudh, in the Oudh Rev. Dept.

SIR,—With reference to the correspondence ending with your letter No. 1994 R., dated the 11th ultimo, I am directed to say that the Governor-General in Council confirms the settlement of the Fyzabad district for a period of 30 years, dating from the season in which the revised assessment was introduced in the several parganas of the district, on the understanding that relief will be given promptly in individual cases where there are grounds for considering that the revenue demand is burdensome.

---











